

EXHIBIT 5

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
3
4

5 IN RE: JOHNSON & JOHNSON)
6 TALCUM POWER PRODUCTS MARKETING,) MDL NO.
7 SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS) 16-2738(MAS)(RLS)
8 LIABILITY LITIGATION)
9
10

11 DEPOSITION
12 OF
13 PATRICIA G. MOORMAN, Ph.D.
14

15 Tuesday, February 13, 2024
16
17
18

19 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES, INC.
20 877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
21 dep@golkow.com
22
23
24
25

Page 2	Page 4
1 DEPOSITION of PATRICIA G. MOORMAN,	1 I N D E X
2 Ph.D., a witness in the above-entitled action,	2 PAGE
3 taken pursuant to notice, pursuant to the Federal	3 EXAMINATION BY MS. DAVIDSON 6
4 Rules of Civil Procedure before CINDY A. HAYDEN,	4 EXAMINATION BY MS. PARFITT 244
5 RMR, CRR, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, at The	5 EXAMINATION BY MS. DAVIDSON 245
6 Carolina Inn, 211 Pittsboro Street, Chapel Hill,	6 EXAMINATION BY MS. PARFITT 247
7 North Carolina, on the 13th day of February, 2024,	7
8 at 9:05 a.m.	8 E X H I B I T S
9	9
10	10 MOORMAN
11	NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE
12	EXHIBIT 1 Document titled Ovarian 25
13	Cancer Risk Factors
14	EXHIBIT 2 JAMA - Association of Powder 58
15	Use in the Genital Area With
16	Risk of Ovarian Cancer
17	EXHIBIT 3 Addendum to Rule 26 Expert 69
18	Report of Patricia G.
19	Moorman, MSPH, Ph.D. dated
20	11/16/18, Date: April 21,
21	2021
22	EXHIBIT 4 JAMA - Use of Powder in the 83
23	Genital Area and Ovarian
24	Cancer Risk, Examining the
25	Evidence
1 APPEARANCES:	20 EXHIBIT 5 Reproductive Toxicology - 90
2 ASHCRAFT & GEREL, LLP	21 Critical review of the
3 BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQ.	22 association between perineal
4 PATRICK LYONS, ESQ. (Remotely)	23 use of talc powder and risk
5 1825 K Street, N.W.	24 of ovarian cancer
6 Washington, D.C. 20006	23 EXHIBIT 6 Supplemental Expert Report of 104
7 202.783.6400	24 Patricia G. Moorman, MSPH,
8 mparfitt@ashcraftlaw.com	25 Ph.D., dated 11/15/23
9 Counsel for Plaintiffs	25
10 ~ And ~	Page 3
11 LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY	1 EXHIBIT 7 AACR - Genital Powder Use and 115
12 CHRISTOPHER V. TISI, ESQ. (Remotely)	2 Risk of Epithelial Ovarian
13 316 South Baylen St.	3 Cancer in the Ovarian Cancer
14 Pensacola, FL 32502	4 in Women of African Ancestry
15 850.435.7000	5 Consortium
16 ctisi@levinlaw.com	4 EXHIBIT 8 Effects of risk factors for 120
17 ~ And ~	5 ovarian cancer in women with
18 GOLOMB & HONIK, P.C.	6 and without endometriosis
19 RICHARD GOLOMB, ESQ. (Remotely)	6 EXHIBIT 9 Supplemental Table 1 and 2 127
20 1835 Market Street, Suite 2900	7 Phung
21 Philadelphia, PA 19103	8 EXHIBIT 10 Association Between the 134
22 215.985.9177	9 Frequent Use of Perineal
23 rgolomb@golombhonik.com	10 Talcum Powder Products and
24 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOW LLP	11 Ovarian Cancer: a Systematic
25 BY: JESSICA DAVIDSON, ESQ.	12 Review and Meta-analysis
1 ASHER TRANGLE, ESQ.	13 EXHIBIT 11 Supplementary Table 1 153
2 One Manhattan West	14 EXHIBIT 12 Markers of inflammation and 161
3 New York, NY 10001-8602	15 risk of ovarian cancer in
4 212.735.2588	16 Los Angeles County
5 jessica.davidson@skadden.com	17 EXHIBIT 13 Douching and Genital Talc 171
6 asher.trangle@skadden.com	18 Use: Patterns of Use and
7 Counsel for Defendant	19 Reliability of Self-reported
8	20 Exposure
9	21 EXHIBIT 14 The Association Between Talc 173
10	22 Use and Ovarian Cancer: A
11	23 Retrospective Case-Control
12	24 Study in Two US States
13	25 EXHIBIT 15 Supplemental eTable 6 189
14	26 EXHIBIT 16 Gynecologic Oncology - Talc, 211
15	27 body powder, and ovarian
16	28 cancer: A summary of the
17	29 epidemiologic evidence
18	30 EXHIBIT 17 Dr. Harlow's letter in 245
19	31 response to the O'Brien paper
20	32
21	33
22	34
23	35
24	36
25	37

<p>1 P R O C E E D I N G S</p> <p>2 * * *</p> <p>3 PATRICIA G. MOORMAN, Ph.D.,</p> <p>4 having been first duly sworn, was examined and</p> <p>5 testified as follows:</p> <p>6 * * *</p> <p>7 EXAMINATION</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. Dr. Moorman, please state your full</p> <p>10 name for the record.</p> <p>11 A. My name is Patricia Gripka Moorman.</p> <p>12 Q. What's the middle name?</p> <p>13 A. Gripka, G-R-I-P-K-A.</p> <p>14 Q. Is that your maiden name?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>16 Q. You've been deposed before. I know</p> <p>17 that because I've read your depositions. So I'm</p> <p>18 going to forgo all the deposition rules. The main</p> <p>19 thing is to make sure that I finish my question,</p> <p>20 okay, and Michelle has enough time to object</p> <p>21 before you answer. Although that seems so easy,</p> <p>22 everyone messes it up. Okay. Other than that,</p> <p>23 I'm just going to go straight into the</p> <p>24 questioning.</p> <p>25 I assume you met with Ms. Parfitt to</p>	<p>Page 6</p> <p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: Any.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Thank you.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I don't recall any -- I</p> <p>4 don't recall reviewing any other.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. As a scientist, you'd agree that it's</p> <p>7 important to evaluate all available evidence,</p> <p>8 right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, it is important to review all the</p> <p>10 evidence.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know how much money you've</p> <p>12 earned thus far in talc litigation?</p> <p>13 A. Well, it's -- as you know, I -- I did</p> <p>14 work back starting probably about 2018 or so, and</p> <p>15 I believe that I have submitted all of the</p> <p>16 invoices. I -- I don't recall the total amount.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know if it's over or under</p> <p>18 \$200,000?</p> <p>19 A. Over how much?</p> <p>20 Q. 200.</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I -- I really --</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: The -- objection. The</p> <p>24 invoices have been submitted.</p> <p>25 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. Let's just</p>	<p>Page 8</p>
<p>1 prepare for this deposition?</p> <p>2 A. I did.</p> <p>3 Q. When was that?</p> <p>4 A. I met with her yesterday afternoon. I</p> <p>5 met with her for the originally scheduled</p> <p>6 deposition last month. Those two times.</p> <p>7 Q. And did she show you any documents</p> <p>8 that you hadn't previously reviewed or listed as</p> <p>9 materials you considered?</p> <p>10 A. No, I don't believe so.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you have any notes that you've</p> <p>12 taken in this litigation?</p> <p>13 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>14 Q. Are you offering an opinion that</p> <p>15 Johnson's Baby Powder contains asbestos?</p> <p>16 A. My understanding is that there are</p> <p>17 other experts who are testifying to that. I have</p> <p>18 read documents that have indicated such. But my</p> <p>19 opinion is that Johnson's Baby Powder causes</p> <p>20 ovarian cancer regardless of the substances in it.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you reviewed defendant's experts'</p> <p>22 reports with respect to testing of Johnson's Baby</p> <p>23 Powder for asbestos?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Can you be</p> <p>25 more specific? Which reports?</p>	<p>Page 7</p> <p>1 go off the record for one second because I</p> <p>2 may be mistaken.</p> <p>3 * * *</p> <p>4 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the</p> <p>5 proceedings from 9:09 a.m. to 9:10 a.m.)</p> <p>6 * * *</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: We have available for</p> <p>8 you the invoices that have been submitted</p> <p>9 to the MDL for her federal cases. The most</p> <p>10 recent ones -- you should have everything</p> <p>11 at the last deposition.</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. We have all the MDL stuff. But my</p> <p>14 question was: What's the total you've billed for</p> <p>15 talc litigation?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: If she knows. We don't</p> <p>17 have any other invoices here.</p> <p>18 Trish, if you know. If you don't</p> <p>19 know, don't guess.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know the</p> <p>21 total. You know, you have the invoices for</p> <p>22 the MDL litigation, the amount for the 2021</p> <p>23 report. It was probably 40-ish hours that</p> <p>24 I billed. I would -- but -- but that is an</p> <p>25 estimate definitely.</p>	<p>Page 9</p>

<p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Who did you invoice for the 3 2021 report?</p> <p>4 A. Steve Faries, who was at Mueller law 5 firm in Texas had asked me to do that.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. And I had submitted it to --</p> <p>8 Q. Oh, so that wasn't through Michelle. 9 I didn't understand that. And then other than 10 Kleiner, Ingham and MDL?</p> <p>11 A. Kleiner?</p> <p>12 Q. Kleiner is Philadelphia.</p> <p>13 A. Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q. Ingham is Missouri.</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Okay. Just for the 16 record, she has not submitted Kleiner or 17 Ingham to the MDL, so we don't have --</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: That wasn't my 19 question.</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Well, we don't have the 21 invoices, and she doesn't either.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: I know, but that wasn't 23 my question. You interrupted my question. 24 You broke the one rule I made.</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: I'm sorry. I'm -- I'm</p>	<p>Page 10</p> <p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: And so I don't know --</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I'm sorry.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. When you said -- did you -- were you 6 deposed in that case?</p> <p>7 A. No, I was not.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So other than Guthrie, Ingham 9 and the MDL, have you provided a report or been 10 deposed in any other talc case?</p> <p>11 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Perfect. We can move on.</p> <p>13 So our records show about 102,000 plus 14 the 40 hours to get us to about 125,000?</p> <p>15 MR. TRANGLE: 118,000.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Does that sound about right, \$120,000?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>19 You can answer.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: You know, again, you -- 21 I have submitted those invoices. They're 22 accurate to the best of my knowledge, but I 23 do not recall the total sum. It does not 24 sound, like, wildly out of whack, so -- but 25 I -- I don't know how close it is.</p>
<p>1 trying to clarify.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: My one rule.</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: I know. I'm trying to 4 clarify, Jessica.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: I know. Michelle and I 6 are going to get along today.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Other than Kleiner, Philadelphia; 9 Ingham, Missouri; and the MDL, have you -- have 10 you provided any testimony or reports in any other 11 talc cases?</p> <p>12 A. The Kleiner -- I'm -- I do not recall 13 that name. The name for the 2021 report was 14 Guthrie.</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I thought you 16 had told me it was Kleiner.</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: No.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: You said it was for 19 Philadelphia.</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: No. It is Philadelphia. 21 I have no idea which case it is.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, it's another 23 Philadelphia case.</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: So I don't know that 25 case.</p>	<p>Page 11</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. What percentage of your income over 3 the last several years has come from talc 4 litigation?</p> <p>5 A. Well, as you -- as you probably know 6 if you looked at my CV, I retired from Duke 7 University in summer of 2021. And so in terms of 8 earned income, I have no income from talc in 2023, 9 2022 -- I'm sorry. I misspoke a little bit. I 10 think -- let's see. What was the invoice for? It 11 was like 17,000?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: And just so you know, 13 Jessica, I'm showing her the two invoices, 14 so --</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Right. Yeah.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: So --</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Let's just introduce this as a 21 demonstrative, which is, we put your invoices on 22 one page. That will make your life easier. This 23 is all we've got.</p> <p>24 A. Okay. So, in 2023, it was \$17,000. 25 And in terms of my earned income, that was the</p>

<p>1 bulk of it. But at this point, my income is 2 basically my retirement income. And this 3 represents, the 17,000, I would say probably 4 10 percent or less of my -- my -- our income.</p> <p>5 Q. When you say "our income," you're 6 including your spouse's income?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you get a pension from Duke?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Relevance. 10 And I'm going to object with regard to any 11 question regarding her pension. That's not 12 relevant.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. But I -- I have 14 a right to ask it. She said she has 15 unearned income.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. I'm just trying to understand. Is 18 that a pension from Duke that you're talking 19 about?</p> <p>20 A. There is not a pension from Duke. 21 There was -- you know, throughout my career, I 22 contributed to 403(b) --</p> <p>23 Q. Got it.</p> <p>24 A. -- or whatever, and so there is some 25 income from that.</p>	<p>Page 14</p> <p>1 testimony as well as the testimony of all of the 2 plaintiffs' experts were excluded, which I clearly 3 disagreed with, because the methodology that I 4 used is the same methodology that I've used in 5 this case, which has been approved by the court. 6 It's the same methodology that I used throughout 7 my career when I'm writing papers, writing grants, 8 reviewing papers, reviewing grants.</p> <p>9 Q. And you've read that opinion?</p> <p>10 A. I read -- yeah, a couple of years ago 11 I did read --</p> <p>12 Q. The parts about you. It's a long 13 opinion, I understand.</p> <p>14 A. Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q. Is that what you're saying? You 16 focused in on --</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, I read it a couple of years ago, 18 and I -- I can't say that I read every single word 19 of the opinion.</p> <p>20 Q. I'm a lawyer. I thought the opinion 21 was long. Very thorough, but long.</p> <p>22 Okay. So do you have any remaining 23 activities with UNC or Duke?</p> <p>24 A. I am professor emerita in the 25 Department of Community -- yeah -- Family Medicine</p>
<p>1 Q. Got it.</p> <p>2 And is the only other litigation that 3 you've been involved in the last few years Zantac?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5 Q. And do you know how much you've made 6 in the Zantac litigation?</p> <p>7 A. Again, I do not recall the exact 8 amount. I know that I billed for several hundred 9 hours.</p> <p>10 Q. You billed for several hundred hours?</p> <p>11 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>12 Q. And was your rate 400 an hour?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, it was.</p> <p>14 Q. Are you still involved in Zantac 15 litigation?</p> <p>16 A. No, I am not.</p> <p>17 Q. When did you stop being involved?</p> <p>18 A. The last -- I gave a deposition. I 19 think it was in October of 2022.</p> <p>20 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>21 A. And that was the last work that I did 22 with that.</p> <p>23 Q. Are you aware that the federal court 24 excluded your testimony there?</p> <p>25 A. I am aware that the testimony -- my</p>	<p>Page 15</p> <p>1 and Community Health. They changed their -- the 2 department name a few years ago. And -- so I have 3 some privileges in that regard.</p> <p>4 I am included on e-mails and so 5 departmental meetings, seminars and such like 6 that. I have access to the Duke library. Since I 7 have retired, once in a while, not too often, I 8 will be asked could I review something. But 9 that's about it.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know Katie O'Brien?</p> <p>11 A. I have never met her, to my knowledge.</p> <p>12 I obviously have read several of her papers.</p> <p>13 Q. She lives in the Research Triangle.</p> <p>14 That's why I asked.</p> <p>15 A. Right. Yeah.</p> <p>16 Q. But you've never come across her 17 professionally?</p> <p>18 A. No. I believe that she works at 19 NIEHS. I know some of the people in that group, 20 but I don't believe that I have ever met her.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you ever spoken to her, 22 communicated with her by email?</p> <p>23 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>24 Q. Did you reach out to her with any 25 questions about any of her papers?</p>

<p>1 A. No, I did not.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you still an adjunct professor at</p> <p>3 UNC?</p> <p>4 A. When I retired, I had stopped that as</p> <p>5 well.</p> <p>6 Q. So your CV says adjunct associate</p> <p>7 professor 2005 till present at UNC. That just</p> <p>8 needs to be updated?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, it does.</p> <p>10 Q. When did you stop doing that?</p> <p>11 A. The last time that I actually did any</p> <p>12 work related to that adjunct appointment was when</p> <p>13 I was on a dissertation committee that -- I want</p> <p>14 to say that it was probably like 2019 when she</p> <p>15 defended. It was pre-COVID.</p> <p>16 Q. When was the last time you taught a</p> <p>17 course?</p> <p>18 A. It's -- I'm not remembering the exact</p> <p>19 year. I -- probably about 2018, '19, something</p> <p>20 like that.</p> <p>21 Q. And what was that course?</p> <p>22 A. The course was called Evidence-Based</p> <p>23 Practice, and I actually taught Evidence-Based</p> <p>24 Practice 1 and 2. They -- these were courses for</p> <p>25 the physician assistant students. The physician</p>	<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 Q. Have you spoken in any public forum</p> <p>2 about talc and ovarian cancer since 2019?</p> <p>3 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you recall what the judge in Zantac</p> <p>5 said as to why she was excluding your opinions?</p> <p>6 A. It has been a couple of years since</p> <p>7 I've read that opinion. Right off the top of my</p> <p>8 head, I -- I can't remember a lot of the details.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you remember any of the details?</p> <p>10 A. Some of it was -- I cited some data</p> <p>11 related to the indium A in food products, and</p> <p>12 despite nutritional epidemiology being a</p> <p>13 well-respected field, I think that the judge did</p> <p>14 not like that we were using that as part of the --</p> <p>15 or that I was using that as part of my arguments.</p> <p>16 But generally, I -- the methodology,</p> <p>17 as I said before, is what I have used throughout</p> <p>18 my career, and I did not think that it was -- I</p> <p>19 didn't agree with that decision.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you reached out to any public</p> <p>21 health organizations about talc and ovarian cancer</p> <p>22 since 2019?</p> <p>23 A. To the extent that I speak through the</p> <p>24 publications, and so my -- as being a part of a</p> <p>25 co-author on another paper with talc, that was</p>
<p>1 assistant program was in my department, and so the</p> <p>2 first-year students took Evidence-Based Practice</p> <p>3 1, and the second-year students took EBP 2.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you mention talc in that course?</p> <p>5 A. I don't recall if I did. I certainly</p> <p>6 didn't emphasize it in any way.</p> <p>7 Q. Have you authored any publications</p> <p>8 concerning talc and ovarian cancer since January</p> <p>9 2019?</p> <p>10 A. Have I authored? Yes. I am a</p> <p>11 co-author on a paper. Colette Davis was the first</p> <p>12 author. And that was part of the Ovarian Cancer</p> <p>13 in Women of African Ancestry Consortium. And so I</p> <p>14 was a co-author on that paper.</p> <p>15 Q. Any other papers?</p> <p>16 A. Related to talc, no, I don't believe</p> <p>17 so.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you have any planned papers or</p> <p>19 papers under way with regard to talc?</p> <p>20 A. There is nothing in progress, no.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you ever published any papers</p> <p>22 about asbestos and ovarian cancer?</p> <p>23 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you have any plans to do so?</p> <p>25 A. Nothing that's in progress, no.</p>	<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 certainly considered by public health</p> <p>2 organizations. But have I directly addressed</p> <p>3 public -- a public health organization? No, I</p> <p>4 have not.</p> <p>5 Q. And when you say through your papers,</p> <p>6 you're talking about the Davis paper?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. When was the last time you went on the</p> <p>9 ACOG website?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you ever been on the ACOG</p> <p>12 website?</p> <p>13 A. I'm sure I have over the course of my</p> <p>14 career.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you ever looked at what ACOG has</p> <p>16 to say about risk factors for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>17 A. I am sure I have at some point. I</p> <p>18 don't recall when I did that.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you aware they updated their FAQ</p> <p>20 for ovarian cancer in 2022?</p> <p>21 A. I don't recall seeing that, no.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know whether they list talc as</p> <p>23 a risk factor for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>24 A. Like I said, I haven't -- I don't</p> <p>25 recall the last time I looked at their website.</p>

<p>1 So I -- I don't know what it says currently.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you aware that ACOG has a section</p> <p>3 on their FAQ with recommendations on how to reduce</p> <p>4 the risk for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>5 A. Again, it has been so long since I've</p> <p>6 looked at that website that I just -- I -- I don't</p> <p>7 know.</p> <p>8 Q. I believe you testified in 2019 that</p> <p>9 you disagreed with ACOG on the -- on its list of</p> <p>10 risk factors for ovarian cancer. Have you ever</p> <p>11 reached out to ACOG to express your view that you</p> <p>12 disagree with ACOG's views on ovarian cancer?</p> <p>13 A. I have not.</p> <p>14 Q. Does either Duke or UNC advise women</p> <p>15 not to use talc?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: You're talking about</p> <p>18 universities, and I am not aware of</p> <p>19 anything at either university -- that I</p> <p>20 don't know what individual physicians tell</p> <p>21 their patients.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Have you ever looked to see if either</p> <p>24 Duke Hospital or UNC Hospital has on their website</p> <p>25 a list of risk factors for ovarian cancer?</p>	<p>Page 22</p> <p>1 then I was going to say "for ovarian cancer." So</p> <p>2 just let's give ten seconds. It's better for</p> <p>3 Michelle, too, because then she can object.</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: She's a New Yorker. She</p> <p>5 speaks fast.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Okay. Could you please</p> <p>7 restate it?</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. No, it's fine. I think you got it.</p> <p>10 What I had said was: Have you ever</p> <p>11 reached out to either Duke Hospital or UNC</p> <p>12 Hospital to suggest that they add talc as a</p> <p>13 potential risk factor for ovarian cancer on their</p> <p>14 website?</p> <p>15 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>16 Q. Now we have a clear record.</p> <p>17 Okay. Are you familiar with SGO?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you ever been on their website?</p> <p>20 A. I might have at some point. I don't</p> <p>21 recall.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know if they list risk factors</p> <p>23 for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>24 A. As I said, I don't recall when I have</p> <p>25 been on their website.</p>
<p>1 A. I am not aware of that at -- at Duke.</p> <p>2 I have never looked at UNC.</p> <p>3 Q. Just to be clear, you don't know</p> <p>4 whether Duke or UNC has a web -- either one has a</p> <p>5 website on which either hospital lists risk</p> <p>6 factors for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>7 A. I am not aware of any.</p> <p>8 Q. Have you ever contacted Duke or</p> <p>9 UNC Hospital and suggested that they add talc as a</p> <p>10 potential risk factor on their websites --</p> <p>11 A. I have not.</p> <p>12 Q. I was in the middle of my question.</p> <p>13 That's no big deal.</p> <p>14 A. I'm sorry.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's just try to make sure that I</p> <p>16 finish my question, just for the court reporter.</p> <p>17 So did you get the full question?</p> <p>18 I mean, you had -- you guessed</p> <p>19 correctly what the question was. I'm just</p> <p>20 worried about a clear record.</p> <p>21 A. I'm sorry. I thought that you were</p> <p>22 finished.</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: I did, too, Jessica.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. I just said "as a risk factor," and</p>	<p>Page 23</p> <p>1 Q. Well, why don't we take a look at it,</p> <p>2 then.</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's mark that as</p> <p>4 Exhibit 1.</p> <p>5 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 1, Document titled</p> <p>6 Ovarian Cancer Risk Factors, was marked for</p> <p>7 identification.)</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I don't see a</p> <p>9 date on this. I may have missed it.</p> <p>10 MR. TRANGLE: There's not on the</p> <p>11 website.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: So if we could just have</p> <p>13 a representation of what date.</p> <p>14 MR. TRANGLE: It's in January 2024.</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: January 2024. Is there</p> <p>16 a specific date in January 2024? You knew</p> <p>17 I was going to ask you that.</p> <p>18 MR. TRANGLE: Yeah.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: You can access it now.</p> <p>20 Make sure it hasn't changed, Asher, while</p> <p>21 we're talking about it.</p> <p>22 MR. TRANGLE: I can do that as well.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. Do you see talc on the list of risk</p> <p>25 factors?</p>

	Page 26	Page 28
1 A. Let me look through.		1 mean, we'll bring it up later. I'm just -- I'm
2 MS. PARFITT: What exhibit is this?		2 just wondering if you have reached out to the NCI
3 THE REPORTER: 1.		3 PDQ to suggest that they revise what they have
4 MS. DAVIDSON: Asher has just		4 written about talc.
5 represented that it has not changed as of		5 A. I have not. You know, I hope that we
6 today, which is February 13, 2024.		6 will talk about that more, because I think that
7 MS. PARFITT: All right. So Exhibit 1		7 their description of what they've put in their
8 is a reflection of what appears on the		8 report I think is not a thorough review of the
9 website for SGO as of --		9 evidence. I think that there is some
10 MR. TRANGLE: February --		10 contradictory information, not only within the
11 MS. PARFITT: -- February 13th --		11 talc statement, but also I think that there is
12 thank you -- 2024. Thank you.		12 some contradiction or some inconsistency in the --
13 THE WITNESS: No, this list of risk		13 what they consider adequate evidence for other
14 factors does not include talc.		14 risk factors as compared to talc.
15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:		15 Q. Have you ever reached out to anyone
16 Q. Do you disagree with the SGO's		16 involved in the NCI PDQ to share this opinion?
17 decision not to list talc here?		17 A. No, I have not.
18 A. I don't know what their process is for		18 Q. When you talk about other risk
19 making these determinations. I -- I agree with		19 factors, are you talking about breastfeeding?
20 Health Canada, which went through a very thorough		20 MS. PARFITT: Objection to form.
21 systematic review of the literature and came to		21 THE WITNESS: That is one of the --
22 the conclusion that it was a risk factor. I don't		22 well, it's actually a protective factor.
23 know that they have gone through a similar process		23 That is not particularly what I had in
24 to arrive at that.		24 mind.
25 Q. Have you -- have you contacted SGO to		25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:
	Page 27	Page 29
1 find out what process they did go through?		1 Q. At your last deposition, you mentioned
2 A. No, I have not.		2 breastfeeding as -- you're right, it's a
3 Q. Have you contacted SGO to tell them		3 protective factor, but as a factor -- let's say,
4 you disagree with them?		4 as a factor which you thought there was equal
5 A. No, I have not.		5 evidence. Are there other factors you have in
6 Q. We've talked about the NCI PDQ with		6 mind?
7 you before. When I say "we," that's a collective		7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.
8 royal "we." Whoever deposed you in 2019 -- I		8 THE WITNESS: Yes, there are at least
9 believe it was Scott James at Shook Hardy -- you		9 two other factors that I can think of.
10 guys talked about NCI's PDQ. Do you recall that?		10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:
11 A. Vaguely. Yes, I do vaguely recall.		11 Q. What are those two factors?
12 Q. And you're aware that that PDQ was		12 A. The -- again, it would be very helpful
13 updated in 2023?		13 if we could --
14 MS. PARFITT: Objection.		14 MS. DAVIDSON: We're going to look at
15 THE WITNESS: I am. And I'm aware		15 the PDQ later. She said she has two
16 that it has been updated. I don't know the		16 factors in mind. I want to know what those
17 exact date when it was updated.		17 are, and then we'll look at the --
18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:		18 MS. PARFITT: Okay.
19 Q. And you're aware that as of that		19 MS. DAVIDSON: -- PDQ later.
20 update, which was October 2023, the NCI PDQ says		20 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, we can do it --
21 there's inadequate evidence of an association,		21 your deposition. Believe me --
22 correct?		22 MS. DAVIDSON: Correct.
23 A. Could we bring up that document since		23 MS. PARFITT: -- I'm not trying to
24 you brought it up?		24 control it. But if you're going to talk
25 Q. Yeah, I don't have any other -- I		25 about that -- it was fine to ask the

	Page 30		Page 32
1	question about whether or not she has	1	Q. Have you taken a look at the CDC
2	complained to them about --	2	website to see the list of risk factors they have
3	MS. DAVIDSON: I understand.	3	for ovarian cancer?
4	MS. PARFITT: -- her opinion --	4	A. I have. I don't remember the last
5	MS. DAVIDSON: But she just said, I	5	time I looked at it.
6	have two factors in mind.	6	Q. The last time you looked, was talc on
7	MS. PARFITT: She can identify them --	7	the list?
8	MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah.	8	MS. PARFITT: Objection.
9	MS. PARFITT: -- but that's all she'll	9	THE WITNESS: I don't remember
10	do.	10	specifically. I just don't remember.
11	MS. DAVIDSON: And that's all I want.	11	BY MS. DAVIDSON:
12	MS. PARFITT: If there's any further	12	Q. Do you believe the CDC should have
13	explanation --	13	talc listed as a risk factor for ovarian cancer?
14	MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. I'm not --	14	A. It is my opinion that talc is a risk
15	MS. PARFITT: -- we'll wait till you	15	factor for ovarian cancer. And, yes, I would -- I
16	have the document --	16	think that it would be a good thing to include.
17	MS. DAVIDSON: Correct.	17	Q. Have you ever reached out to the CDC
18	MS. PARFITT: -- in front of you.	18	and told them that?
19	MS. DAVIDSON: I completely agree.	19	A. I have not.
20	We're on the same page.	20	Q. So just to make sure I've got your
21	THE WITNESS: Okay. One of them is	21	testimony right, you've never reached out to ACOG,
22	the DMPA, the depot medroxyprogesterone	22	SGO, NCI PDQ, CDC, Duke or North Carolina to
23	acetate.	23	suggest that any of them add talc as a risk factor
24	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	24	for ovarian cancer, correct?
25	Q. Uh-huh. And the other?	25	A. I have not. I feel like my -- my work
	Page 31		Page 33
1	A. The other one is obesity --	1	speaks for itself.
2	Q. Okay. Got it.	2	Q. And when you say your work, you're
3	A. -- or body mass index.	3	referring to the Davis paper?
4	Q. Thanks. Those were all my questions.	4	A. I'm referring not only to that --
5	Are you familiar with the CDC?	5	that's the most recent one -- but also the
6	A. Yes, I am.	6	previous papers published related to talc.
7	Q. Is that a highly respected	7	Q. And what are those previous papers?
8	organization?	8	A. The -- Schildkraut was the first
9	A. Generally, yes.	9	author. That was 2016-ish. And then also
10	Q. Is ACOG a highly respected	10	published a paper from the North Carolina ovarian
11	organization?	11	cancer study much earlier that also provided data
12	A. Yes. Generally, it is.	12	on talc and ovarian cancer. That was probably, I
13	Q. Is SGO a highly respected	13	don't know, 2009-ish.
14	organization?	14	Q. In the Schildkraut paper, in the
15	A. I would say, generally, it is, yes.	15	conclusions, did you guys state that talc causes
16	Q. The CDC is considered a respected	16	ovarian cancer?
17	authority on public health issues, right?	17	MS. PARFITT: Can she have a copy?
18	A. Please repeat that.	18	MS. DAVIDSON: She wrote it.
19	MS. DAVIDSON: Did you get it?	19	MS. PARFITT: Jessica, she may have
20	THE REPORTER: Yes.	20	written it, but it was back in 2016.
21	(The following question was read back:	21	MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.
22	Q: The CDC is considered a respected	22	MS. PARFITT: Do you think it's
23	authority on public health issues, right?)	23	fair --
24	THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.	24	BY MS. DAVIDSON:
25	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	25	Q. Do you recall -- do you recall whether

<p>1 the Schildkraut paper states that talc causes 2 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Let's get the paper.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, it's my 5 deposition. I will give her the article if 6 we're asking any further --</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: May I --</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: -- questions beyond 9 this one.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: May I see?</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm just asking if she 12 recalls.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: She's asking for it.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Do you recall, sitting here, 16 whether --</p> <p>17 A. I would like to --</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: She's asked for the 19 paper, Jessica.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I would just like to --</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: I just want to know if 22 she recalls. If the answer is no, we'll 23 move on, and we can look at the paper 24 later.</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: The other response could</p>	Page 34	<p>1 sitting here today --</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Are you instructing her 3 not to answer?</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: I am instructing her to 5 answer a question when the witness has said 6 to you, Counsel, I would like to have a 7 copy of the paper and I'll answer --</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: I understand.</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: -- your one question, 10 and you refuse to give it to her.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Because I just --</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Just hand her the paper.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: I wanted to know what 14 she recalls.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Do you recall whether the 17 Schildkraut --</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: It's not a memory test.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: It's not a memory test.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall whether the Schildkraut 23 paper says in its conclusion that talc causes 24 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: If you can answer that</p>	Page 36
<p>1 be that I can't respond to your question 2 because you won't give me the paper.</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: That -- that's called 4 coaching the witness.</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Well --</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall, sitting here today, 8 without looking at the paper whether it states 9 that talc causes ovarian cancer?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: The witness has asked 11 for the paper.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: I understand.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Counsel, as a 14 courtesy --</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: -- could you please give 17 her the paper, and she'll give you a 18 response to your question. I assure she 19 will.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: And then if I ask any 21 further questions about the paper beyond 22 this one, I will show her the paper.</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: No.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. I would just like to know whether</p>	Page 35	<p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I do not recall the 3 exact phrasing that we used. I -- I 4 believe that we certainly -- the conclusion 5 indicated that we found increased risk of 6 ovarian cancer. The exact phrasing, I 7 don't recall. It's a paper, as we know, 8 that was published seven years ago.</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. The same question as to Davis: Do you 11 recall in Davis, a much more recent paper, whether 12 you said in the conclusion that talc causes 13 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I am going to 15 object. I really want --</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: These --</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: -- this to go in a 18 conciliatory manner.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: I really do. This is -- 21 why don't you just show her the paper.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay, Michelle. I will 23 when we get into these topics with more 24 detail. Right now, I'm just asking a very 25 general question --</p>	Page 37

	Page 38		Page 40
1	MS. PARFITT: It's --	1	take it to the judge.
2	MS. DAVIDSON: -- whether you recall	2	MS. DAVIDSON: We will do so.
3	whether Davis concludes that talc causes	3	Let's take a break.
4	ovarian cancer --	4	MS. PARFITT: Yes.
5	MS. PARFITT: I'm going to object --	5	* * *
6	MS. DAVIDSON: -- and the simple	6	(Whereupon, there was a recess in the
7	answer is "no" if she doesn't recall,	7	proceedings from 9:43 a.m. to 9:50 a.m.)
8	Michelle.	8	* * *
9	MS. PARFITT: It's not a question --	9	BY MS. DAVIDSON:
10	MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle --	10	Q. Dr. Moorman, can you recall, sitting
11	MS. PARFITT: -- of whether she	11	here today, any paper you have ever published
12	recalls, Jessica.	12	outside the litigation in which you state that
13	MS. DAVIDSON: But that's my question.	13	talc causes ovarian cancer?
14	MS. PARFITT: But she's telling you --	14	MS. PARFITT: Objection.
15	MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.	15	THE WITNESS: I -- what is more
16	MS. PARFITT: -- she can answer the	16	typical in papers -- in the papers that we
17	question accurately if you give her --	17	write, we describe what is -- whether talc
18	MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.	18	shows increased risk and so on.
19	MS. PARFITT: -- the paper. Isn't	19	There is actually quite a literature
20	that what you want?	20	about using the word "cause." Sometimes
21	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	21	people will object to using the word
22	Q. My question is whether you recall that	22	"cause" if it does not come from a
23	about Davis.	23	randomized control trial.
24	MS. PARFITT: If you can't answer	24	The literature -- one author who
25	without the paper, tell her.	25	discussed this -- I believe his last name
	Page 39		Page 41
1	MS. DAVIDSON: That's the question,	1	was Hernan -- talked about that is a
2	"Do you recall?" If she can't recall	2	disservice, because, of course, when we are
3	without the paper, the answer is "no."	3	doing observational epidemiology, when
4	MS. PARFITT: There's -- don't even	4	we're looking at risk factors, we are
5	ask the question.	5	trying to identify causes of disease.
6	MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.	6	And -- so this literature actually
7	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	7	advocated more use of what he termed as the
8	Q. Okay. Do you recall in the Davis	8	"C-word."
9	paper, which is quite recent, whether the authors,	9	But generally, it is more common
10	including you, conclude that talc causes ovarian	10	that -- described we observed increased
11	cancer?	11	risk, for example, with talc use in ovarian
12	MS. PARFITT: I am going to instruct	12	cancer.
13	you not to answer the question.	13	BY MS. DAVIDSON:
14	If you want to take that one to the	14	Q. So that's a "no," you have never
15	judge, I'll be happy to do that, too, and	15	actually published a paper outside this litigation
16	indicated to counsel she asked for the	16	that states talc causes ovarian cancer --
17	paper; you won't give it to her. How do	17	MS. PARFITT: Objection.
18	you want to go?	18	BY MS. DAVIDSON:
19	BY MS. DAVIDSON:	19	Q. -- correct?
20	Q. Are you refusing to answer that	20	MS. PARFITT: She's answered the
21	question, whether you recall that?	21	question.
22	MS. PARFITT: I'm telling her not to	22	MS. DAVIDSON: You -- you interrupted
23	answer the question if you won't give her	23	me.
24	the document.	24	MS. PARFITT: Sorry about that. Are
25	Don't answer. Put it down. We can	25	you done? Object --

<p>Page 42</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. Do you need me to repeat the question</p> <p>3 since it was interrupted?</p> <p>4 A. Please repeat the question.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you repeat it?</p> <p>6 (The following question was read back:</p> <p>7 Q: So that's a "no," you have never</p> <p>8 actually published a paper outside this</p> <p>9 litigation that states talc causes ovarian</p> <p>10 cancer, correct?)</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>12 answered.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I -- I believe that I</p> <p>14 did answer the question that I --</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So Michelle's objections are</p> <p>17 for the record. They're not intended to coach --</p> <p>18 they are not supposed to coach you in your answer.</p> <p>19 I'm -- I'm allowed to ask the question</p> <p>20 differently, and I want to make sure I have your</p> <p>21 testimony clear. So can you please answer the</p> <p>22 question?</p> <p>23 A. Okay.</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I do not recall writing</p>	<p>Page 44</p> <p>1 2018, I think; is that right? 2018?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: November 16th, 2018.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: That sounds right.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. Have you conducted a new Bradford Hill</p> <p>6 analysis since then?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>8 You can answer.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No. I -- there has been</p> <p>10 some additions to the data, but generally,</p> <p>11 I think that the new data support the</p> <p>12 conclusions that I -- that I made from that</p> <p>13 original Bradford Hill analysis.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. But there's nowhere I can go to see a</p> <p>16 revised or updated Bradford Hill analysis, right?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. I see you brought two binders</p> <p>21 today.</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. What are those binders?</p> <p>24 A. These binders contain the updated</p> <p>25 reports, the one from 2021, the one from 2023 and</p>
<p>Page 43</p> <p>1 a paper outside of this litigation where I</p> <p>2 said that talc causes ovarian cancer.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. Thank you. We can move on, then.</p> <p>5 Could you remind me the name of the</p> <p>6 lawyer who you worked with on your 2021 report?</p> <p>7 A. His name was Steve Faries, spelled</p> <p>8 F-A-R-I-E-S.</p> <p>9 Q. And were the MDL lawyers involved at</p> <p>10 all in that report?</p> <p>11 A. The only person I recall speaking with</p> <p>12 on that was Mr. Faries.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you share that report with MDL</p> <p>14 lawyers in 2021?</p> <p>15 A. I did not.</p> <p>16 Q. When did you first share that report</p> <p>17 to MDL lawyers?</p> <p>18 A. Probably sometime in 2023. I had</p> <p>19 essentially no contact with the MDL lawyers while</p> <p>20 all the bankruptcy stuff was going on.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you follow the bankruptcy in the</p> <p>22 class?</p> <p>23 A. I read some news articles about it.</p> <p>24 Yes, I did.</p> <p>25 Q. So your first MDL report was dated</p>	<p>Page 45</p> <p>1 the -- largely, the articles that were cited or</p> <p>2 some papers that I was aware of that had been</p> <p>3 published since 2019.</p> <p>4 Q. And who put those binders together?</p> <p>5 A. They were put together by Michelle's</p> <p>6 office. You know, I had provided largely -- you</p> <p>7 know, these were the articles, and they -- they</p> <p>8 assembled the binders.</p> <p>9 Q. And do you have notes in there?</p> <p>10 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you have an updated list of</p> <p>12 materials considered?</p> <p>13 A. A complete merging what -- from</p> <p>14 everything from the --</p> <p>15 Q. Everything you've considered in the</p> <p>16 MDL proceeding.</p> <p>17 A. I have this list of references that</p> <p>18 are in these binders. It is not combined into a</p> <p>19 single list with what I had -- had previously been</p> <p>20 submitted back when I have been deposed</p> <p>21 previously.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: And for the record,</p> <p>23 Jessica, there were probably two Dropboxes.</p> <p>24 One back in 2018, when she was deposed in</p> <p>25 2019, we provided a very complete Dropbox</p>

<p>1 of all the articles. And then again in 2 2023, we've also provided you with a 3 Dropbox of all the articles --</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: But you don't have a 5 list? You never put them on a list.</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: It is a list. It is a 7 list. If you go to your -- if you go to --</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: It's not a list. It's 9 just a bunch of articles, according to 10 Asher.</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Well, it's --</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: I mean, we made our own 13 list.</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Well, it's -- it's -- I 15 would call it a list. Our office put 16 together a list. What you have in that 17 Dropbox is a collection of articles.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: But you don't have a 19 piece of paper that says "Materials 20 Reviewed" like we usually do for an expert.</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: It was a Dropbox. I 22 didn't prepare it. It was a Dropbox of all 23 the articles. Maybe it didn't have perfect 24 titles to -- I mean, didn't have a specific 25 title --</p>	<p>1 neutral author than one published by a defense 2 expert?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I will tell you what I 5 taught my students when I would teach them 6 how to read a paper and going through the 7 various parts of the paper, including the 8 acknowledgments, the funding sources.</p> <p>9 I said, if there is some mention of, 10 like, a drug study funded by Big Pharma or 11 someone working as a consultant, it is 12 important to note that, but they should not 13 disregard the findings of that paper just 14 on that basis.</p> <p>15 They should do -- just look at it like 16 any other paper, the methodology, how they 17 report the findings, their interpretation 18 of the findings. And if there is anything 19 that seems concerning, they should take 20 that into account, but it's not a reason to 21 discount the findings from a paper.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Do you give any more weight when 24 you're reviewing a study to one where the authors 25 don't have any ties to litigation?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>
<p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: We couldn't find, like, 2 a materials reviewed list.</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Gotcha. Okay. I 4 think --</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: If there was one, 6 that's what I'm asking.</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Yeah, I don't believe 8 there was.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: It was just a Dropbox of 11 all the materials. I think that's what we 12 received from you-all as well, not always 13 an assembly of a list of them in addition 14 to the documents.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Do you agree that whenever you're 17 reviewing scientific literature it's important to 18 know potential sources of bias?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, it is important to consider 20 potential sources of bias. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Are conflicts of interest a potential 22 source of bias?</p> <p>23 A. A potential source of bias, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. All things being equal, would you have 25 fewer bias concerns with a paper published by a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 A. I think that I look at the 2 methodology. I -- I just look at -- that weighs 3 more than any of the -- you know, who it's funded 4 by or anything. Is their methodology, their 5 interpretation appropriate? That's what I give 6 weight to.</p> <p>7 Q. Did you numerically assign grades to 8 the various epidemiological studies on talc?</p> <p>9 A. Did I assign grades to --</p> <p>10 Q. What grades or weights -- like, is -- 11 is there a way for me to know how you weighed each 12 study, like a quantitative weighing?</p> <p>13 A. No. I -- I did not.</p> <p>14 Q. So someone reading your report -- is 15 there a way for someone reading your report to 16 know which studies you assigned more weight to and 17 which studies you assigned less weight to?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I provided a narrative 20 of what I considered strengths and 21 limitations of the studies, and if I had 22 concerns about a study, I tried to use -- I 23 tried to explain why I had concerns about a 24 given study.</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>

<p>1 Q. Are you aware of any letter to the 2 editor of any scientific journal about talc and 3 ovarian cancer written by somebody who's not 4 plaintiff's expert?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I have seen some letters 7 to the editor like that, yes.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. And can you recall what they are?</p> <p>10 A. Right offhand, I can't recall the 11 authors, no, not off the top of my head.</p> <p>12 Q. When do you recall seeing a letter to 13 the editor of a journal involving talc and ovarian 14 cancer that was not written by a plaintiff's 15 expert?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Asked and answered.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I'm -- you're asking me 18 to recall when and -- I mean, I read the 19 literature on a routine basis. When did 20 I -- I see it? I -- I don't know. I can't 21 give an answer to that.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. But you're confident that such a 24 letter exists?</p> <p>25 A. I feel like I have read letters to the</p>	<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 A. O'Brien? I truly do not know the full 2 list of experts. I don't -- to my knowledge, she 3 is not, but I don't know.</p> <p>4 Q. When you read the O'Brien, Wentzensen 5 papers, did you look to see whether they had any 6 conflicts of interest?</p> <p>7 A. I probably did when I read the paper. 8 That's part of what I typically do. I don't 9 recall whether they reported any conflicts of 10 interest. At this moment, I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q. Would that have weighed into your 12 evaluation of the O'Brien, Wentzensen papers?</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: It is just -- as I 15 stated before, that is a factor that is 16 considered, but it is not -- if it's a good 17 paper, it doesn't matter. I mean, if, you 18 know, there -- I would, again, review the 19 methodology, how they described results, 20 their interpretation of it, and that would 21 be -- drive my opinion more so than who 22 might be supporting any of the work or any 23 potential conflicts of interest.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Had you heard of Dr. O'Brien before</p>
<p>1 editor, yes, yeah.</p> <p>2 Q. You feel like you have read letters to 3 the editor that were not by a plaintiff's expert?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you recall whether any of the 6 letters involving the O'Brien paper involved 7 plaintiffs' experts? I'm sorry. That was not a 8 good question.</p> <p>9 Do you recall whether anyone who is 10 not a plaintiff's expert has written a letter to 11 the editor regarding O'Brien?</p> <p>12 A. I -- I don't -- I don't recall. I 13 just -- I don't know. And, you know -- and, also, 14 there are numerous -- more than one paper by 15 O'Brien, and so I don't know --</p> <p>16 Q. Any O'Brien paper. Do you know 17 whether anybody has ever written a letter to an 18 editor with respect to any O'Brien paper who is 19 not a plaintiff's expert?</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I don't know the answer 22 to that.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. Is O'Brien an expert in this 25 litigation?</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>1 this litigation?</p> <p>2 A. If I'm not mistaken, she might have 3 done her Ph.D. work at UNC. I'm not absolutely 4 sure. And so I think I might have seen her name 5 sometime along -- along the way as, like, a 6 doctoral student. But I can't -- I'm not --</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have any reason to think she's 8 biased?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Do I have any reason to 11 think she's biased? I have never met her, 12 talked about -- I've only seen her -- 13 what -- I only know her through the work 14 that she has published.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. So you have no basis to doubt her 17 credibility?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I said I -- I don't know 20 her personally. I only know some of the 21 papers that she has written, so...</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Are you familiar with Dr. Wentzensen?</p> <p>24 A. I -- again, I might have met him at 25 some meeting years ago, but I don't know him</p>
	Page 53

<p>1 personally. I know some of his work. I've read 2 his papers over the years.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that 4 Dr. Wentzensen is biased?</p> <p>5 A. Again, I do not know him personally. 6 I only know him for his work. I have no basis to 7 make that judgment.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you familiar with JAMA?</p> <p>9 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>10 Q. Are you familiar with JAMA?</p> <p>11 A. JAMA, the journal?</p> <p>12 Q. (Nods head.)</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Is JAMA considered a prestigious 15 publication?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, it's a very well-regarded 17 journal.</p> <p>18 Q. Are you offering any opinions in this 19 litigation about subtypes of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>20 A. My -- my opinion is to -- related to 21 ovarian cancer overall. I certainly am aware of 22 some data on subtypes that has been published, but 23 my opinion is related to ovarian cancer overall.</p> <p>24 Q. So are you offering opinions 25 specifically, for example, about clear cell?</p>	<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 Q. Sitting here in 2024, do you believe 2 there is sufficient scientific data from which to 3 conclude that talc use can cause clear cell 4 carcinoma?</p> <p>5 A. Most of the papers addressed ovarian 6 cancer overall, epithelial ovarian cancer as a 7 whole. And that is what my opinion is based on.</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you repeat the 9 question?</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. I don't think you answered the 12 question as asked.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Disagree.</p> <p>14 (The following question was read back: 15 Q: Sitting here in 2024, do you 16 believe there is sufficient scientific data 17 from which to conclude that talc use can 18 cause clear cell carcinoma?)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I believe that there is 20 sufficient evidence that talc can cause 21 ovarian cancer. What has been reported in 22 the literature is mostly focused on 23 epithelial ovarian cancer as a whole. 24 The -- that's -- I mean, that's what I have 25 based my opinion on. I have not expressed</p>
<p>1 A. I -- I said my opinion is related to 2 epithelial ovarian cancer overall.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether 4 there's sufficient data to conclude that talc use 5 can cause clear cell cancer?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. This was 7 addressed -- you tell me if it wasn't, 8 Jessica; and I'm going to try to limit 9 these objections as well -- back at the 10 time of her original deposition where she 11 was exhaustively, another eight-hour 12 deposition, asked about risk factors. And 13 I've let you talk about those. You made 14 them relevant, but certainly about the 15 subtypes.</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: There's been four 17 years --</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: So I'm not sure where 19 you're going.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm going to the fact 21 that there's been four years of litigation.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. So sitting here in 2024 --</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm sorry. Of science.</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 an opinion specifically about clear cell.</p> <p>2 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>3 Q. Do you know how many bellwether 4 plaintiffs there are --</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: I'm sorry. I didn't --</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. -- in this litigation?</p> <p>8 A. Please --</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: I -- I didn't hear you, 10 Jessica.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Your --</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know how many bellwether 14 plaintiffs there are in this litigation?</p> <p>15 A. I'm not sure. I really don't know for 16 sure.</p> <p>17 Q. Have you reviewed any materials 18 regarding the actual plaintiffs in this 19 litigation?</p> <p>20 A. No, I have -- I have not.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you know what subtypes of ovarian 22 cancer the -- the six bellwether plaintiffs -- 23 there are six -- have been diagnosed with?</p> <p>24 A. Okay. I just told you that I have not 25 received -- or I have not reviewed any of the</p>
	Page 57

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 individual information on those, you now tell me, 2 six women. So, obviously, I do not know what type 3 of ovarian cancer they had.</p> <p>4 Q. And you also don't know how long they 5 claim to have used Johnson's Baby Powder?</p> <p>6 A. Once again, I have not reviewed any 7 specific information about those patients.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. Let's look at O'Brien 9 2020, which we're going to mark as Exhibit 2.</p> <p>10 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 2, JAMA - Association 11 of Powder Use in the Genital Area With Risk 12 of Ovarian Cancer, was marked for 13 identification.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Why don't you just use the one that 16 we're --</p> <p>17 A. Okay.</p> <p>18 Q. -- for the record.</p> <p>19 A. All right. I'm happy to do so.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle, do you want 21 one, or you've got your own?</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: I'm just keeping a 23 little collection here.</p> <p>24 (Off-the-record conference.)</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 risk of 1.0.</p> <p>2 Q. So that's not an association?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. You would agree that there's no 7 association in this paper between long-term talc 8 use and ovarian cancer for patent women only, 9 right?</p> <p>10 A. As we have pointed out many times in 11 reports, long-term use can reflect a variety of 12 patterns of use. It could be a couple of times a 13 year on really hot summer days over 20 years. But 14 it doesn't tell you how frequently they used it.</p> <p>15 And so, ideally, you would like to 16 have some measure that was a measure of the total 17 exposure, which would be a combination of the 18 years of use and the frequency of use.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you recall my question?</p> <p>20 A. I -- you answered -- I believe that I 21 answered that it showed --</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: What was my question?</p> <p>23 Can you repeat it, because the answer 24 didn't relate to the question?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 Q. How many women in total were included 2 in the O'Brien paper?</p> <p>3 A. How many people in total?</p> <p>4 Q. A cohort sample?</p> <p>5 A. The total size of the cohort, that's 6 reported in Table 1, and it was 257,044 women.</p> <p>7 Q. And if we could look at Table 2. What 8 was the adjusted hazard ratio for exposure to talc 9 and the development of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>10 A. For all women, it was -- the hazard 11 ratio was 1.08. For women with a patent 12 reproductive tract, 1.13.</p> <p>13 Q. And if we're looking at the top half 14 of Table 2, "Ever Use Powder in the Genital Area," 15 are any of those adjusted hazard ratios 16 statistically significant?</p> <p>17 A. No, they are not.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you include this breakdown by 19 cohort in your report?</p> <p>20 A. I did not report it for each cohort, 21 no. I -- I reported the overall.</p> <p>22 Q. Did the authors find a significant 23 association between long-term talc use and ovarian 24 cancer for patent women?</p> <p>25 A. They reported an adjusted relative</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 (The following question was read back: 2 Q. You would agree that there's no 3 association in this paper between long-term 4 talc use and ovarian cancer for patent 5 women only, right?)</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Okay. I already -- 7 MS. PARFITT: Asked and answered.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I answered the question 9 that the relative risk was 1, which was no 10 association.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Wait. Have you 14 finished?</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Did you include that in your report?</p> <p>17 A. I don't believe that I did.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Have you looked at Table 4 of 19 O'Brien?</p> <p>20 A. I have.</p> <p>21 Q. I'm sorry?</p> <p>22 A. I have looked at it.</p> <p>23 Q. And what does Table 4 address?</p> <p>24 A. This addresses the relationship 25 between talc use and ovarian cancer by various</p>

<p>1 subcategories of ovarian cancer. And they limited 2 it to all medically confirmed cases. And so they 3 looked at it by invasiveness, by tumor location, 4 histotype and then another categorization of 5 histotype.</p> <p>6 Q. If you looked at all medically 7 confirmed cases, what was the hazard ratio for 8 frequent use?</p> <p>9 A. It was 1.05.</p> <p>10 Q. With a confidence interval of?</p> <p>11 A. .92 to 1.20.</p> <p>12 Q. Is that statistically significant?</p> <p>13 A. It is not.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you include in your report any 15 discussion of Table 4?</p> <p>16 A. I don't believe that I did.</p> <p>17 Q. And did you include in your report any 18 discussion of O'Brien's subset analysis with 19 respect to histotypes?</p> <p>20 A. I don't believe that I did in that 21 report.</p> <p>22 Q. Does O'Brien find a statistically 23 significant hazard ratio for any histological 24 subtype?</p> <p>25 A. Within the subtypes, they found</p>	<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 not only the sample size, but also the number of 2 cases. That's a very important consideration when 3 considering cohort studies.</p> <p>4 Q. How many cases were there in O'Brien?</p> <p>5 A. Overall, there were 2,213 cases. The 6 number of cases by cohort varied considerably. In 7 the Nurses' Health Study II, despite having 61,000 8 women in the cohort, there were only 76 cases. 9 The bulk of the cases came from the Nurses' Health 10 Study. It was 1,258.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you conducted a power analysis of 12 this paper?</p> <p>13 A. I have not.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you recall in your 2018 report that 15 you criticized some of the cohort studies for 16 having what you believe to be was insufficient 17 follow-up time?</p> <p>18 A. I think that that was a comment that I 19 made, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you, in your updated report, 21 address the fact that O'Brien added several years 22 of follow-up time for each of those cohort 23 studies?</p> <p>24 A. I did not specifically address that in 25 my report, no.</p>
<p>1 relative risk greater than 1 for serous, 2 endometrioid, mucinous, and clear cell, but the 3 confidence intervals for each of those included 1. 4 So they were not statistically significant.</p> <p>5 Q. Fair to say there isn't a single 6 statistically significant hazard ratio in Table 4?</p> <p>7 A. No. All of the confidence intervals 8 in this table include 1.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you believe that larger sample 10 sizes make a study more reliable?</p> <p>11 A. In and of itself, sample size alone 12 does not make a reliable study. You can have a 13 very good large study. You can have a really poor 14 large study. It's just one --</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Please let her finish.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: It's just one 17 consideration in evaluating the study.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. I totally understand. But is larger 20 sample size a strength that you would note when 21 you're discussing a study?</p> <p>22 A. It's something that would be 23 considered. And larger sample sizes are 24 generally -- generally desirable. But, again, 25 in -- you have to consider -- you have to consider</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>1 Q. Do you consider the longer follow-up 2 time to be a strength of the O'Brien paper?</p> <p>3 A. In general, longer follow-up is more 4 desirable. It's one factor that is considered in 5 evaluating cohort studies.</p> <p>6 Q. So is that a strength of the O'Brien 7 paper, that it has longer follow-up for each of 8 the cohort studies?</p> <p>9 A. As compared to the original reports, 10 it could be a strength, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. How many years of follow-up does 12 O'Brien have, for example, for NHSI?</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: For you, "NHSI," 14 Nurses' Health Study I.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: For the Nurses' Health 16 Study, they report a median follow-up time 17 of 33 years.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. How about for WHI, Women's Health 20 Initiative?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, "WHI" is Women's Health 22 Initiative. They report median follow-up time of 23 17 years.</p> <p>24 Q. How much weight do you give findings 25 that are slightly above 1.0 if the confidence</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 interval crosses 1.0?</p> <p>2 A. I apologize. It is --</p> <p>3 Q. Do you want to take a minute, or are</p> <p>4 you okay?</p> <p>5 A. If you don't mind, just --</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: You want to do that just</p> <p>7 get your voice.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Yes. Do you want to answer this</p> <p>11 question and then take a minute, just because we</p> <p>12 have a question pending?</p> <p>13 A. Okay. So please repeat the question.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. If you don't remember the</p> <p>15 question, we can take a break and then do it.</p> <p>16 A. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: No problem.</p> <p>18 * * *</p> <p>19 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the</p> <p>20 proceedings from 10:29 a.m. to 10:52 a.m.)</p> <p>21 * * *</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know Dr. Clarke-Pearson?</p> <p>24 A. Only by reputation. I might have met</p> <p>25 him many years ago, but I don't know him</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 significant, there is no association.</p> <p>2 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>3 Q. Are you aware of any medical journal</p> <p>4 that does not require authors to include a</p> <p>5 confidence interval in their epidemiological</p> <p>6 studies?</p> <p>7 A. Some journals -- and, again, right off</p> <p>8 the top of my head, I can't name which -- what are</p> <p>9 the standards for each journal. Some will report</p> <p>10 only P values, but it is pretty common that</p> <p>11 either -- that some measure of statistical</p> <p>12 significance is included.</p> <p>13 Q. You're not aware of any paper that</p> <p>14 doesn't require authors to indicate statistical</p> <p>15 significance?</p> <p>16 A. You know, again, you're asking me</p> <p>17 about the universe of journals, and I -- I just</p> <p>18 don't know exactly what all their requirements</p> <p>19 are. I have stated that the most common thing is</p> <p>20 that confidence intervals or sometimes P values</p> <p>21 are reported.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm just getting at the fact that you</p> <p>23 said the most common. So I wasn't sure if you</p> <p>24 were aware of anybody -- of any journal that</p> <p>25 operates differently.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 personally.</p> <p>2 Q. I guess this is a bigger town than I</p> <p>3 think.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: I forgot the question I</p> <p>5 had asked that was pending when we took our</p> <p>6 break for the coughing. Can you repeat the</p> <p>7 question?</p> <p>8 (The following question was read back:</p> <p>9 Q: How much weight do you give</p> <p>10 findings that are slightly above 1.0 if the</p> <p>11 confidence interval crosses 1.0?)</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I think that</p> <p>13 primarily --</p> <p>14 (Brief interruption.)</p> <p>15 (Off-the-record conference.)</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: So when I look at</p> <p>17 findings, it is -- I look at the point</p> <p>18 estimate, the hazard ratio, relative risk,</p> <p>19 odds ratio, and that tells the association</p> <p>20 in that study.</p> <p>21 Statistical significance is something</p> <p>22 that I look at. But I certainly do not</p> <p>23 fall into the dichotomy that something is</p> <p>24 statistically significant, that's an</p> <p>25 association, and if it's not statistically</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 A. I can't think of any journal right</p> <p>2 offhand.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Why don't we mark your 2023</p> <p>4 report as Exhibit 3.</p> <p>5 All right. Asher has corrected me,</p> <p>6 and he thinks I want to mark as Exhibit 3 your</p> <p>7 2021 supplemental report. He's convenient to have</p> <p>8 around.</p> <p>9 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 3, Addendum to Rule</p> <p>10 26 Expert Report of Patricia G. Moorman,</p> <p>11 MSPH, Ph.D. dated 11/16/18, Date:</p> <p>12 April 21, 2021, was marked for</p> <p>13 identification.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. We're marking as Exhibit 3 a 2021</p> <p>16 report addendum to Rule 26 expert report of</p> <p>17 Patricia Moorman.</p> <p>18 In your 2021 paper, you have a</p> <p>19 statement that the result of nondifferential</p> <p>20 misclassification is generally a bias toward the</p> <p>21 null. Can you explain what you meant by that?</p> <p>22 A. Okay. So nondifferential</p> <p>23 misclassification usually refers to an error in</p> <p>24 classifying, for example, an exposure. But it is</p> <p>25 not different between people who -- like in a</p>

<p>1 cohort study, it's not different between women --</p> <p>2 people who go on to develop the disease of</p> <p>3 interest and those who do not. And so it's --</p> <p>4 just kind of reflects that there's going to be</p> <p>5 errors in recall.</p> <p>6 If I ask anybody about something that</p> <p>7 happened 10 years ago, 5 years ago or 20 years</p> <p>8 ago, they will not have perfect recall. And so</p> <p>9 there will be some misclassification of the</p> <p>10 exposure. But if it's not different, you know,</p> <p>11 between people who ultimately go on to develop --</p> <p>12 who become a case versus people who do not become</p> <p>13 a case, that's considered nondifferential.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. And why would that bias toward the</p> <p>16 null?</p> <p>17 A. Just mathematically you can show that</p> <p>18 if it is.</p> <p>19 Q. Because there's more case -- there's</p> <p>20 more -- because there's fewer people with cases;</p> <p>21 is that what you're saying?</p> <p>22 A. No, that's really not it. It's kind</p> <p>23 of like if you were -- I'm trying to think how to</p> <p>24 do -- it's kind of putting people in the wrong</p> <p>25 category.</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 misreporting of exposure or misclassification of</p> <p>2 exposure can occur for a number of reasons. And</p> <p>3 I'll give a couple of examples from the various</p> <p>4 studies.</p> <p>5 The sister study, their questionnaire</p> <p>6 asked about use in the previous 12 months when</p> <p>7 they were enrolled into the study and also when</p> <p>8 they were -- the women were young. I think it was</p> <p>9 10 to 13. And I believe that's the measure that</p> <p>10 they used in this.</p> <p>11 So anyone who had used talc starting</p> <p>12 after they were 13 but discontinued it before they</p> <p>13 enrolled in the study, that would not have been</p> <p>14 captured.</p> <p>15 Q. And when you say "that would not have</p> <p>16 been captured," that -- that would not have been</p> <p>17 captured in O'Brien, that would not have been</p> <p>18 captioned in Gonzalez, or did O'Brien and Gonzalez</p> <p>19 use the same metric?</p> <p>20 A. I was talking about the sister study,</p> <p>21 specifically. So that was -- I -- if I'm</p> <p>22 recalling correctly, the measure that they used in</p> <p>23 this -- the data that they used in the O'Brien</p> <p>24 study used both the age 10 to 13 and the age -- in</p> <p>25 the 12 months before enrollment into the cohort.</p>
<p>1 So you have -- it's a little bit of a</p> <p>2 mixing of effect. Some people who were truly</p> <p>3 exposed are in the nonexposed category and</p> <p>4 possibly vice versa. And so long as that does</p> <p>5 not -- so long as that is not differential between</p> <p>6 cases and controls, it could be shown</p> <p>7 mathematically that when it is a dichotomous</p> <p>8 outcome, that is usually a -- rather, a</p> <p>9 dichotomous exposure, it is biased towards the</p> <p>10 null.</p> <p>11 Q. But what is the math that results in</p> <p>12 that? Like, what is the reason?</p> <p>13 A. It's basic -- I have seen it. I'm</p> <p>14 having a hard time explaining. I didn't expect to</p> <p>15 have to explain this.</p> <p>16 But just, basically, it shows that it</p> <p>17 is a mixing of effect, and it can be demonstrated</p> <p>18 mathematically that it will result in a bias</p> <p>19 towards the null. I'm sorry that I'm not</p> <p>20 explaining that better. But it has been</p> <p>21 demonstrated. It's been in pretty much every epi</p> <p>22 textbook you would look at.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you believe that misreporting of</p> <p>24 exposure was a concern in O'Brien 2020?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I -- I do. If we -- so the</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 The Gonzalez paper, their analysis was based on</p> <p>2 use of talc only in the 12 months before</p> <p>3 enrollment.</p> <p>4 Q. So -- so O'Brien --</p> <p>5 A. I --</p> <p>6 Q. Just if I could continue.</p> <p>7 The -- so the O'Brien paper included a</p> <p>8 broader definition of exposure for the sister</p> <p>9 study than Gonzalez did, correct?</p> <p>10 A. That is my understanding, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Did the hazard ratio change as a</p> <p>12 result?</p> <p>13 A. Well, the hazard ratio that they</p> <p>14 reported here was --</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: And you're referring to</p> <p>16 what table?</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Okay. I am referring to</p> <p>18 Table 2.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Thank you.</p> <p>20 MS. DAVIDSON: Please don't interrupt</p> <p>21 her.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: I just needed some</p> <p>23 guidance myself.</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: After she's done with</p> <p>25 her answer.</p>

<p>1 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: I think it's appropriate</p> <p>3 to get some clarification.</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: No, it's not.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Okay. So in the</p> <p>6 Gonzalez paper, as I recall, the hazard</p> <p>7 ratio was a real outlier. It was like .73,</p> <p>8 .74, something like that, and here it is</p> <p>9 1.02. So it was a change.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Do you consider 1.02 to be a positive</p> <p>12 association?</p> <p>13 A. It is greater than 1. And so in that</p> <p>14 sense, it is a positive association. It's -- it's</p> <p>15 very close to the null value, obviously.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you believe that O'Brien found an</p> <p>17 increased risk with talc use and ovarian cancer in</p> <p>18 the sister study?</p> <p>19 A. They reported only a very slight</p> <p>20 increase, 1.02.</p> <p>21 Q. And do you consider 1.02 to be a</p> <p>22 slight increase in risk?</p> <p>23 A. That's what the point estimate says --</p> <p>24 Q. Even if it's -- even if it's not</p> <p>25 statistically significant?</p>	<p>Page 74</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I -- I think that I have</p> <p>2 answered it. You -- when we look at odds</p> <p>3 ratios, 1 means no increase or no decrease</p> <p>4 in risk. Any values below 1 indicates a</p> <p>5 decrease in risk. 1.02 is above 1. It is</p> <p>6 a very slight increase in risk.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. I understand what you're saying, but</p> <p>9 my question was: Have you ever in a paper stated</p> <p>10 that a 1.02 risk ratio nonstatistically</p> <p>11 significant reflected an increased risk for an</p> <p>12 exposure in a disease?</p> <p>13 A. And I think that I answered it. It's,</p> <p>14 like, I would typically just describe it as, you</p> <p>15 know, this was the odds ratio or risk ratio and</p> <p>16 the confidence interval and indicate, you know, it</p> <p>17 was not a statistically significant increased</p> <p>18 risk.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you read the Gossett editorial in</p> <p>20 JAMA regarding O'Brien?</p> <p>21 A. The Gossett?</p> <p>22 Q. Dana Gossett editorial that came out</p> <p>23 in the same version -- in the same edition of JAMA</p> <p>24 as the O'Brien paper?</p> <p>25 A. I believe that I did read it. It's</p>
<p>Page 75</p> <p>1 A. As I said before, the point estimate</p> <p>2 is what those data show in that study. You had</p> <p>3 asked about misclassification in the O'Brien</p> <p>4 study --</p> <p>5 Q. We'll go back to that. I just want --</p> <p>6 A. Okay.</p> <p>7 Q. -- to continue with this.</p> <p>8 A. All right. I just wanted to --</p> <p>9 Q. Have you --</p> <p>10 A. -- let you know that I was not</p> <p>11 finished with that answer.</p> <p>12 Q. Understood.</p> <p>13 Have you ever published a paper in</p> <p>14 which you said that 1.02 was an increased risk?</p> <p>15 A. I -- what is typical is that I will</p> <p>16 report the -- the odds ratio and the confidence</p> <p>17 interval and just what it -- what it is. It's</p> <p>18 like -- it was -- I might describe it as: It was</p> <p>19 not a statistically significant increase in risk.</p> <p>20 Q. My question is different. Have you</p> <p>21 ever characterized, outside of this litigation, a</p> <p>22 1.02 nonstatistically significant risk ratio as an</p> <p>23 increased risk?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>25 answered.</p>	<p>Page 75</p> <p>1 been quite a while since I have looked at that</p> <p>2 paper.</p> <p>3 Q. That was not, that I could see, on</p> <p>4 your reliance list. Do you know why?</p> <p>5 A. I don't. I mean, I don't remember --</p> <p>6 I mean, I might have overlooked it at the time. I</p> <p>7 just -- I don't remember.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Did the O'Brien study find an</p> <p>9 overlap in confidence intervals for the patent and</p> <p>10 nonpatent subgroups?</p> <p>11 A. Let me go to -- for the overall</p> <p>12 adjusted odds ratio that are reported in Table 2</p> <p>13 for all women, it was 1.08 confidence interval.</p> <p>14 .99 to 1.17 for women with patent reproductive</p> <p>15 tracts. It was 1.13 with a confidence interval of</p> <p>16 1.01 to 1.26. So, yes, there is overlap in those</p> <p>17 confidence intervals.</p> <p>18 Q. Does the stratification of women into</p> <p>19 exposed -- does the stratification of women into</p> <p>20 patent and nonpatent groups, is that the same as</p> <p>21 stratifying women into exposed and nonexposed</p> <p>22 categories?</p> <p>23 A. Well, in this case, the main exposure</p> <p>24 of interest is talc. That is the exposure of</p> <p>25 interest here. The patent and not patent are --</p>

Page 78

Page 80

1 it's a subgroup. They're subgroups and so a
 2 subgroup analysis. It's not the exposure that
 3 you're looking at.

4 It's -- if you were thinking of the
 5 patency of the reproductive tract as a risk factor
 6 for ovarian -- as an exposure, you would say: Are
 7 women with patent reproductive tracts at higher
 8 risk than those with nonpatent reproductive
 9 tracts?

10 Q. That's not my question. My question
 11 is: When you stratify women into patent and
 12 nonpatent groups, would the nonpatent women --
 13 does that mean none of them were exposed to talc?

14 A. Oh, okay. No, it does not, because
 15 it -- the patency is defined as having one of
 16 these surgeries, so a tubal ligation or a
 17 hysterectomy. And so women have those at
 18 different points in their lives.

19 I think that women are typically in
 20 their 30s when they have tubal ligations. That's
 21 the most common age. And most common age for
 22 hysterectomy is in their 40s. So anyone who had
 23 used talc before their surgery, they had exposure.
 24 They likely had exposure.

25 Q. Have any of the papers addressed when

Page 79
 1 women who use talc in their perineal area
 2 typically start, at what age?

3 A. At what age they begin using it? In
 4 O'Brien's 2023 paper, they asked about use in --
 5 at various points in their age. Again, if we
 6 could pull that up, I can demonstrate what -- what
 7 I'm talking about. But as I --

8 MS. PARFITT: Look at your report.

9 THE WITNESS: Okay.

10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

11 Q. Wait. Can you just finish your
 12 answer?

13 A. Okay.

14 MS. PARFITT: If you can. If you need
 15 the report --

16 MS. DAVIDSON: She was saying
 17 something.

18 MS. PARFITT: I --

19 MS. DAVIDSON: And you keep
 20 interrupting her.

21 MS. PARFITT: No, no, no. Jessica --

22 MS. DAVIDSON: She said, "as I."
 23 That's the middle of the sentence, and you
 24 interrupted her.

25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

1 Q. I'm just asking you --
 2 MS. PARFITT: Okay. Jessica --
 3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

4 Q. Can you finish your answer?
 5 MS. PARFITT: -- I've done very well
 6 so far.

7 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. So let's
 8 continue.

9 MS. PARFITT: No, no. Let me just
 10 say, if she needs the paper, though --
 11 again, we just don't need to have this
 12 ruckus.

13 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I'm not asking a
 14 question about that paper. I'm asking
 15 whether --

16 MS. PARFITT: She said --

17 MS. DAVIDSON: -- she's aware of any
 18 papers that discuss at what age women start
 19 using talc.

20 MS. PARFITT: And as she said, "if I
 21 could see the paper." If you need the
 22 court reporter to read that back, she said,
 23 "if I could see the paper."

24 MS. DAVIDSON: Michelle --

25 MS. PARFITT: Yes.

Page 81

1 MS. DAVIDSON: -- please don't
 2 testify.

3 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, I'm not
 4 testifying. I want an accurate record --

5 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.

6 MS. PARFITT: -- and I think you do,
 7 too. I know the judge does. So that's
 8 what we'll ask her. Do you need the paper?

9 MS. DAVIDSON: That's not --

10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

11 Q. I'm asking whether you are aware of
 12 any papers that address when -- the age at which
 13 women start using talcum powder, those women who
 14 use it. That's all I'm asking.

15 A. Okay. I am relying on my memory
 16 here --

17 Q. Uh-huh.

18 A. -- of the O'Brien 2023 paper.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. And I believe that they did question
 21 women about their use at various ages. And if I
 22 am recalling the paper correctly, and if I could
 23 look at the paper, we could confirm that my memory
 24 is accurate. Do you mind if I look at that paper?

25 Q. I don't mind at all, but I want to get

<p>1 a list. Like, I have a way of questions that I'm 2 asking. And I'd like to know -- I'd like the full 3 list of papers you recall that address, if any, 4 the ages at which women start using ovarian cancer 5 [sic]. So I don't want to in the middle of a 6 question move on.</p> <p>7 So can you just tell me the full 8 list -- that was my question -- full list of 9 papers you recall that address the age at which 10 women start using ovarian -- using talcum powder 11 in their perineal area.</p> <p>12 A. Okay. I recall that the O'Brien 2023 13 paper addressed that in the sister study. I can't 14 recall specifically whether other studies asked 15 about age at first use. It seems like there have 16 been some, but I can't remember specifically which 17 ones.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. If we could pull 19 up the Gossett editorial, which we're going 20 to mark as Exhibit 3.</p> <p>21 THE REPORTER: We're on 4.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: 4? Sorry.</p> <p>23 MR. TRANGLE: 4.</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, right, because as 25 Exhibit 3 we marked the 2021 paper. I</p>	<p>Page 82</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Do you see halfway down that paragraph 3 there's a sentence "Thus"?</p> <p>4 A. Uh-huh. 5 Q. Can you read that sentence? 6 A. Wait. I'm sorry. 7 Q. Can you read aloud the sentence that 8 begins with the word "Thus"?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Give her a moment, 10 please.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Well, I just want to 12 read the context of the paragraph.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. It's the fourth sentence. 15 A. Yes, I'm just -- I just want it in the 16 context.</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Jessica, she's asked for 18 a moment to read it.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: You've told her to ask 20 for a moment to read it, Michelle.</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: No. Actually, I didn't. 22 I didn't.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. Are you planning to read the whole 25 paper? Because if so, we'll go off the record.</p>
<p>1 forgot to write that down. I was engrossed 2 in the conversation.</p> <p>3 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 4, JAMA - Use of 4 Powder in the Genital Area and Ovarian 5 Cancer Risk, Examining the Evidence, was 6 marked for identification.)</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Exhibit 4 is an editorial entitled 9 "Use of Powder in the Genital Area and Ovarian 10 Cancer Risk, Examining the Evidence." Do you 11 recall reading this paper?</p> <p>12 A. I -- yeah, I -- I believe that I have 13 looked at this editorial.</p> <p>14 Q. Is there a reason why your report 15 discusses Dr. Cramer's letter about the O'Brien 16 2020 paper but doesn't discuss this editorial?</p> <p>17 A. I -- I don't -- I mean, like I've 18 said, I read this. I -- I -- there was no 19 particular reason why I did not include it. 20 Just -- no particular reason.</p> <p>21 Q. If you could turn to Page 30.</p> <p>22 A. Okay.</p> <p>23 Q. Halfway down the page that starts with 24 the word "Given." Do you see the paragraph that 25 starts with the word "Given" in the left column?</p>	<p>Page 83</p> <p>1 A. No. I just -- you asked about one 2 specific paragraph, and I just wanted to read that 3 paragraph. Okay. And so you asked me to read the 4 sentence beginning with "Thus."</p> <p>5 Thus, the stratification of the groups 6 as patent and nonpatent does not clearly group 7 women into exposed and nonexposed categories.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you agree with that?</p> <p>9 A. I -- yes, I -- my previous answer 10 discussed how women with -- who have had these 11 surgeries could have had exposure before the 12 surgeries, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Can you read the next sentence?</p> <p>14 A. The fact that there are no significant 15 differences in the hazard ratios in the patent 16 (HR, 1.13 [95 percent confidence interval, 1.01 to 17 1.26]) and nonpatent subgroups (hazard ratio .99, 18 [95 percent confidence interval, 0.86 to 1.15]; 19 P value for heterogeneity comparing these 20 subgroups of 1 -- .15) confirms the overall 21 conclusion that there is no demonstrable 22 statistically significant association between use 23 of the powder in the genital area and ovarian 24 cancer risk.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you agree with that statement?</p>

<p>1 A. That statement is -- it's stating the 2 data that's presented in the -- the table -- or in 3 the paper that the P value for interaction was 4 .15. And so it is not a statistically 5 significant -- wait. "Confirms the overall 6 conclusion that" --</p> <p>7 You know, I don't -- I have to say 8 that I don't agree with -- with that statement. 9 They did find a significant association with women 10 who have the patent reproductive tract. And so I 11 don't -- I don't agree with that statement because 12 there is -- there is a statistical significant 13 association with that one subgroup of women.</p> <p>14 Q. Is she saying there isn't?</p> <p>15 A. It says there is no demonstrable 16 statistically significant association between use 17 of powder in the genital area and ovarian cancer 18 risk. And so I -- I disagree with that. It's -- 19 I think --</p> <p>20 Q. But what's the reason she gives for 21 that statement?</p> <p>22 A. She's saying that there's no 23 significant difference between the two groups, 24 which in terms of a statistically significant 25 interaction between the two groups, the P value</p>	<p>Page 86</p> <p>1 expert in litigation or not.</p> <p>2 Q. She doesn't disclose any conflict of 3 interest suggesting any involvement in litigation, 4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. She doesn't describe -- disclose 6 conflict of interest related to talc. It's -- she 7 does disclose other funding.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you give more weight to Dr. Cramer 9 and Dr. Harlow's letters than you do to the 10 Gossett editorial?</p> <p>11 A. As I have stated repeatedly today, I 12 consider what is -- what is reported in the paper. 13 And, you know, certainly, knowing any potential 14 conflicts of interest, it's -- it doesn't mean 15 that that -- what they're saying is -- is wrong or 16 right. It's -- I just evaluate it on the comments 17 that they made, the points that they made.</p> <p>18 Q. And so based on the points that were 19 made in this editorial, you didn't think it 20 merited inclusion in your expert report?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 22 her testimony.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: As I said, I -- it was, 24 perhaps, an oversight that I -- I didn't 25 include that in my reference list. I -- I</p>
<p>1 of .15, that is an accurate statement. 2 But the fact that you are seeing a 3 statistically significant increased risk in the -- 4 the one group, the women with the patent 5 reproductive tract, I think that does not 6 demonstrate -- there's no demonstrable 7 statistically significant association between use 8 of powder in the genital tract -- or genital area 9 and ovarian cancer risk.</p> <p>10 Q. Again, you discussed letters to the 11 editor about O'Brien from Drs. Cramer and 12 Dr. Harlow, correct, in your 2023 supplement?</p> <p>13 A. I did.</p> <p>14 Q. And you didn't discuss this, correct?</p> <p>15 A. That is correct.</p> <p>16 Q. And you're aware that Dr. Cramer and 17 Dr. Harlow are plaintiff's experts, right?</p> <p>18 A. I am aware of that.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know whether Dr. O'Brien is an 20 expert in this litigation?</p> <p>21 A. You have already asked me that and 22 I --</p> <p>23 Q. I'm sorry. I meant Dr. Gossett.</p> <p>24 A. I do not know who Dr. Gossett is. No, 25 I have -- I don't know if she -- she or he is an</p>	<p>Page 87</p> <p>1 read it. I -- I obviously -- I -- I didn't 2 comment on it.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. Do you recall testifying at your last 5 deposition that you did not believe the cohort 6 studies had sufficient power and citing a paper by 7 Narod for that proposition?</p> <p>8 A. I recall making some statement. I 9 don't recall exactly what I stated, but that --</p> <p>10 Q. Did you go back to the Narod paper 11 after O'Brien was published in 2020 to see whether 12 the O'Brien paper satisfied what Narod had listed 13 as how many women would be needed to establish 14 sufficient power?</p> <p>15 A. I did not go back to the Narod paper.</p> <p>16 Q. You recall in 2019 testifying about 17 the Berg -- B-E-R-G-E-N -- Berga because I think 18 it's a European paper, which had done a power 19 analysis of the cohort studies. Do you recall 20 that?</p> <p>21 A. I -- I don't recall. I recall 22 mentioning -- or probably addressing, you know, 23 the -- the systematic review's meta-analysis, 24 including the Berg or Berga study. I don't recall 25 exactly the point that you're making.</p>

Page 90	Page 92
1 Q. Okay. And I believe you testified 2 earlier that you haven't done any sort of power 3 analysis with respect to O'Brien 2020, right? 4 A. No, I did not do any -- 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. -- power analysis. 7 Q. We can move on now. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. So let's mark as 9 Exhibit 5 Taher 2019. 10 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 5, Reproductive 11 Toxicology - Critical review of the 12 association between perineal use of talc 13 powder and risk of ovarian cancer, was 14 marked for identification.) 15 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 16 Q. We're marking as Exhibit 5 a paper 17 entitled "Critical review of the association 18 between perineal use of talc powder and risk of 19 ovarian cancer." First author, Mohamed Kadry 20 Taher. 21 Are you relying on this paper to 22 support your opinions in this case? 23 A. It is one of the articles that I 24 considered, yes. 25 Q. If we could turn to Table 2. Do the	1 what I thought that I heard from you, so... 2 MS. DAVIDSON: I think it was. 3 Can you repeat again? 4 (The reporter read the requested 5 material.) 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. Looking at what 7 the O'Brien paper reported in Table 4 is 8 they reported a -- for ever use of talc, 9 they reported a hazard ratio of 1.17 with 10 confidence interval from .73 to 1.89. So 11 it was not -- it was a non -- 12 nonstatistically significant increased 13 risk. 14 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 15 Q. Thank you. 16 Now, Taher found that 13 out of 24 17 case-control studies showed a statistically 18 significant association, right? If you'd like, I 19 can read that to you. 20 It's on the last sentence of 94, first 21 sentence of 95. 13 out of 24 case-control studies 22 showed a statistically significant association. 23 Do you see that? Did I read that 24 correctly? 25 A. Yes, you did read that.
Page 91	
1 authors here identify an increased risk between 2 talc use and the development of clear cell 3 carcinoma? 4 A. They report -- and based on one study, 5 they report an effect estimate of 0.63 with a 6 confidence interval that goes from .15 to 2.65. 7 So based on this one study, they do not report an 8 increased risk among women with clear cell. 9 Q. And we just discussed and looked at 10 the O'Brien paper, which found no significant 11 association between talc use and clear cell as 12 well. Do you recall that? 13 A. Again, let me -- would you mind 14 restating your question? 15 MS. DAVIDSON: Court Reporter, could 16 you repeat it? 17 (The following question was read back: 18 Q: And we just discussed and looked 19 at the O'Brien paper, which found no 20 significant association between talc use 21 and clear cell as well. Do you recall 22 that?) 23 THE WITNESS: Was that -- I'm sorry. 24 I -- if you don't mind repeating your 25 question because what she read back was not	1 Q. So that means 11 out of 24 2 case-control studies did not show a significant 3 association, right? 4 A. Not a statistically significant 5 increased risk, yes. Although, it is important to 6 look at the point estimates overall, which are -- 7 nearly all of them report point estimates greater 8 than 1. 9 Q. So you consider those studies to be 10 consistent despite the fact that 11 did not show a 11 statistically significant association? 12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 13 THE WITNESS: As I stated earlier, I 14 do not use statistical significance as a 15 way to dichotomize, yes, there is an 16 association; no, there is not. 17 Look at the point estimate, and from 18 the standpoint that the vast majority of 19 studies show reported point estimates 20 greater than 1 with a majority of them 21 being statistically significant, I would 22 say, yes, the findings are quite 23 consistent. 24 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 25 Q. If you look at Table 2 of Taher. For

<p>1 people who used talc 20-plus years, there is --</p> <p>2 there is no statistically significant association</p> <p>3 with ovarian cancer risk, correct?</p> <p>4 A. What they report is overall risk of</p> <p>5 1.19, the confidence interval from .71 to 1.98.</p> <p>6 So, once again, it's an increased risk that was</p> <p>7 not statistically significant.</p> <p>8 Q. And is that higher or lower than the</p> <p>9 risk ratio reported for women who use talc between</p> <p>10 10 and 20 years?</p> <p>11 A. What they report for women who had</p> <p>12 used it for 10 to 20 years was 1.42. So 1.02 to</p> <p>13 1.99. So statistically significant increased</p> <p>14 risk, and it was a higher point estimate than</p> <p>15 women who had used it for 20-plus years.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you -- did you address that in</p> <p>17 your report?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: In my discussion of this</p> <p>20 article --</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. I can fix my question, because</p> <p>23 Michelle is right, it wasn't very well stated.</p> <p>24 Did you address in your report that</p> <p>25 women who used talc for 20-plus years did not have</p>	<p>Page 94</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. What is it?</p> <p>3 A. It is a framework for evaluating some</p> <p>4 of the strength of the evidence related -- you</p> <p>5 know, I believe that it's commonly used when doing</p> <p>6 meta-analysis and just combining all of the data</p> <p>7 and looking at the strength of the evidence.</p> <p>8 Q. Did -- have you ever used a GRADE</p> <p>9 framework in your work?</p> <p>10 A. If I'm not mistaken, in some of the</p> <p>11 systematic reviews that I've worked on over the</p> <p>12 years, we might have addressed -- we -- I'm pretty</p> <p>13 sure that we did use the GRADE framework.</p> <p>14 Q. How did Taher classify the talc epi</p> <p>15 under the GRADE framework? Page 98 to make your</p> <p>16 life easier.</p> <p>17 A. Okay. In Table 4, the certainty of</p> <p>18 the evidence, they put it as very low.</p> <p>19 Q. Thanks.</p> <p>20 On Page 98, the author states that one</p> <p>21 reason for that is that they deem the findings to</p> <p>22 be subject to an appreciable risk of bias. Do you</p> <p>23 see that?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I do see it.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you disagree with them?</p>	<p>Page 96</p> <p>1 A. I acknowledge that the -- there is</p> <p>2 potential for recall bias. There is potential for</p> <p>3 bias in recalling -- so the nondifferential</p> <p>4 misclassification of the exposure. I think that</p> <p>5 there is the potential. I think that, as has been</p> <p>6 addressed in several papers, there is some</p> <p>7 evidence to suggest that it's probably not as much</p> <p>8 of a problem as some people suggest.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you address in your paper -- in</p> <p>10 your expert report the fact that the Taher</p> <p>11 meta-analysis finds the quality of the evidence --</p> <p>12 the certainty of the evidence to be very low?</p> <p>13 A. I did not put that in my report.</p> <p>14 Q. Why not?</p> <p>15 A. Basically, I did not restate</p> <p>16 everything that was in the papers I was asked</p> <p>17 to -- you know, it was a rather brief summary.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you think that the fact that the</p> <p>19 authors of this meta-analysis found the certainty</p> <p>20 of the evidence to be very low is relevant to</p> <p>21 analyzing the paper?</p> <p>22 A. It's one aspect of looking at the</p> <p>23 paper.</p> <p>24 Q. But you didn't discuss it?</p> <p>25 A. I did not discuss it.</p>
<p>1 a statistically significant association with the</p> <p>2 development of ovarian cancer, whereas women who</p> <p>3 used talc for 10 to 20 years had a higher risk</p> <p>4 ratio and that was statistically significant?</p> <p>5 A. I'm looking at how I stated it in my</p> <p>6 report. What I stated in my report was that they</p> <p>7 noted a possible increasing trend in ovarian</p> <p>8 cancer with risks with increasing cumulative</p> <p>9 exposure to talc, albeit with a high degree of</p> <p>10 uncertainty.</p> <p>11 Q. My question was: Did you report --</p> <p>12 did you state in your report that 20-plus years of</p> <p>13 use had a lower effect estimate and one that is</p> <p>14 not statistically significant as compared to 10 to</p> <p>15 20 years?</p> <p>16 A. And I told you what -- what I did</p> <p>17 report in my report. I didn't repeat every --</p> <p>18 every odds or hazard ratio or whatever -- relative</p> <p>19 risk that was reported. I read to you what I</p> <p>20 reported. I did not specifically say that it was</p> <p>21 the odds -- the relative risks for greater than 20</p> <p>22 years was less than what was reported for 10 to 20</p> <p>23 years.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you know what the GRADE framework</p> <p>25 is? G-R-A-D-E, all caps.</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 A. I acknowledge that the -- there is</p> <p>2 potential for recall bias. There is potential for</p> <p>3 bias in recalling -- so the nondifferential</p> <p>4 misclassification of the exposure. I think that</p> <p>5 there is the potential. I think that, as has been</p> <p>6 addressed in several papers, there is some</p> <p>7 evidence to suggest that it's probably not as much</p> <p>8 of a problem as some people suggest.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you address in your paper -- in</p> <p>10 your expert report the fact that the Taher</p> <p>11 meta-analysis finds the quality of the evidence --</p> <p>12 the certainty of the evidence to be very low?</p> <p>13 A. I did not put that in my report.</p> <p>14 Q. Why not?</p> <p>15 A. Basically, I did not restate</p> <p>16 everything that was in the papers I was asked</p> <p>17 to -- you know, it was a rather brief summary.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you think that the fact that the</p> <p>19 authors of this meta-analysis found the certainty</p> <p>20 of the evidence to be very low is relevant to</p> <p>21 analyzing the paper?</p> <p>22 A. It's one aspect of looking at the</p> <p>23 paper.</p> <p>24 Q. But you didn't discuss it?</p> <p>25 A. I did not discuss it.</p>	<p>Page 97</p>
<p>1 a statistically significant association with the</p> <p>2 development of ovarian cancer, whereas women who</p> <p>3 used talc for 10 to 20 years had a higher risk</p> <p>4 ratio and that was statistically significant?</p> <p>5 A. I'm looking at how I stated it in my</p> <p>6 report. What I stated in my report was that they</p> <p>7 noted a possible increasing trend in ovarian</p> <p>8 cancer with risks with increasing cumulative</p> <p>9 exposure to talc, albeit with a high degree of</p> <p>10 uncertainty.</p> <p>11 Q. My question was: Did you report --</p> <p>12 did you state in your report that 20-plus years of</p> <p>13 use had a lower effect estimate and one that is</p> <p>14 not statistically significant as compared to 10 to</p> <p>15 20 years?</p> <p>16 A. And I told you what -- what I did</p> <p>17 report in my report. I didn't repeat every --</p> <p>18 every odds or hazard ratio or whatever -- relative</p> <p>19 risk that was reported. I read to you what I</p> <p>20 reported. I did not specifically say that it was</p> <p>21 the odds -- the relative risks for greater than 20</p> <p>22 years was less than what was reported for 10 to 20</p> <p>23 years.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you know what the GRADE framework</p> <p>25 is? G-R-A-D-E, all caps.</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 A. I acknowledge that the -- there is</p> <p>2 potential for recall bias. There is potential for</p> <p>3 bias in recalling -- so the nondifferential</p> <p>4 misclassification of the exposure. I think that</p> <p>5 there is the potential. I think that, as has been</p> <p>6 addressed in several papers, there is some</p> <p>7 evidence to suggest that it's probably not as much</p> <p>8 of a problem as some people suggest.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you address in your paper -- in</p> <p>10 your expert report the fact that the Taher</p> <p>11 meta-analysis finds the quality of the evidence --</p> <p>12 the certainty of the evidence to be very low?</p> <p>13 A. I did not put that in my report.</p> <p>14 Q. Why not?</p> <p>15 A. Basically, I did not restate</p> <p>16 everything that was in the papers I was asked</p> <p>17 to -- you know, it was a rather brief summary.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you think that the fact that the</p> <p>19 authors of this meta-analysis found the certainty</p> <p>20 of the evidence to be very low is relevant to</p> <p>21 analyzing the paper?</p> <p>22 A. It's one aspect of looking at the</p> <p>23 paper.</p> <p>24 Q. But you didn't discuss it?</p> <p>25 A. I did not discuss it.</p>	<p>Page 97</p>

Page 98

Page 100

1 Q. And are any of the authors of Taher
2 plaintiff's experts in this litigation?

3 A. I do not know any of the authors on
4 this paper. And -- so I don't -- and I have never
5 heard their names mentioned as being a plaintiff's
6 expert.

7 Q. And if you look at their conflict of
8 interest disclosure, none of them references any
9 conflict of interest related to this litigation,
10 correct?

11 A. No, I don't -- I don't see that. They
12 report no conflict of interest.

13 Q. Can we look at -- this is -- Michelle
14 likes to say it's not a memory test, but this is a
15 vision test.

16 MS. PARFITT: I have extra glasses.
17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

18 Q. Could we look at Footnote A.

19 A. What page are you on?

20 Q. Footnote A, Page 98 of Taher.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. Do you see that?

23 A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. Can you tell me how they describe what
25 "very low certainty" means?

1 A. We have very little confidence in the
2 effect estimate. The true effect is likely to be
3 substantially different from the estimate of
4 effect.

5 Q. Again, you didn't mention that in your
6 report, correct?

7 A. No, I did not.

8 Q. Have you seen the unpublished Taher
9 manuscript, the one that was attached to the
10 original Health Canada draft?

11 A. I believe that I saw it several years
12 ago.

13 Q. Did you compare it to the final
14 published version?

15 A. I did not.

16 Q. Do you recall that the unpublished
17 draft had a Bradford Hill analysis in it?

18 A. I don't recall specifically. It's
19 been a long time since I read that paper.

20 Q. Fair. I don't recall what I did last
21 week, so...

22 Are you qualified to identify asbestos
23 in a product?

24 A. Am I qualified to identify asbestos in
25 a product? No. That's not my specialty.

1 Q. Do you know what XRD is?

2 A. I believe that one meaning of it --
3 I'm not sure if this is what you're getting at --
4 is X-ray diffraction.

5 Q. That was good. Have you ever done
6 X-ray diffraction?

7 A. No, I have not.

8 Q. Do you know what PLM is?

9 A. I do not. No, I do not know what
10 that --

11 Q. Since you don't know what it is, can
12 I -- is it fair to conclude that you've never done
13 it?

14 A. Just, please, if you wouldn't mind
15 just stating what it is, and I can --

16 Q. Polar light microscopy.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. Have you ever done polar light
19 microscopy?

20 A. No, I have not done PLM.

21 Q. Are you familiar with the term "TEM"?

22 A. Let's see. Again, I think that it's
23 some type of electron microscopy. And I don't
24 remember what the "T" is, but --

25 MS. PARFITT: Transmission --

Page 99

1 A. We have very little confidence in the
2 effect estimate. The true effect is likely to be
3 substantially different from the estimate of
4 effect.

5 Q. Again, you didn't mention that in your
6 report, correct?

7 A. No, I did not.

8 Q. Have you seen the unpublished Taher
9 manuscript, the one that was attached to the
10 original Health Canada draft?

11 A. I believe that I saw it several years
12 ago.

13 Q. Did you compare it to the final
14 published version?

15 A. I did not.

16 Q. Do you recall that the unpublished
17 draft had a Bradford Hill analysis in it?

18 A. I don't recall specifically. It's
19 been a long time since I read that paper.

20 Q. Fair. I don't recall what I did last
21 week, so...

22 Are you qualified to identify asbestos
23 in a product?

24 A. Am I qualified to identify asbestos in
25 a product? No. That's not my specialty.

1 MR. TRANGLE: Electron --

2 MS. PARFITT: -- electron spectro --
3 (Simultaneous talking.)

4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:

5 Q. Transmission. Y'all -- we -- the
6 three of us all seem to agree that the "T" stands
7 for "transmission."

8 A. Okay.

9 Q. And none of us has ever done it
10 either.

11 A. I have not done TEM.

12 Q. Okay. I just wanted you to get a full
13 sentence out there.

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. Do you have an opinion as to what
16 percentage of the Johnson's Baby Powder sold in
17 the United States has asbestos?

18 A. I know that there will be people who
19 are mineral experts who will address that. I have
20 seen some of their reports, but I cannot state an
21 opinion on what proportion of containers have
22 asbestos in them.

23 Q. Have you ever asked plaintiff's
24 counsel to see the defense expert reports about
25 asbestos testing?

<p>1 A. I have not.</p> <p>2 Q. Does your biological plausibility</p> <p>3 opinion turn on whether talc contains asbestos?</p> <p>4 A. My biologic plausibility considered</p> <p>5 asbestos in the talc products as part of the</p> <p>6 biological plausibility, not the sole biologically</p> <p>7 plausible mechanism.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you believe that talc that does not</p> <p>9 contain asbestos can cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>10 A. My opinion is based on talc products,</p> <p>11 whatever is contained in them. And it -- as far</p> <p>12 as I know, there is no way to determine whether or</p> <p>13 not the women -- the talc they reported, whether</p> <p>14 it contained asbestos or not and -- just because</p> <p>15 there's no way to -- to test all the products that</p> <p>16 they used over the years. My opinion, again, to</p> <p>17 restate, is just based on talc products, whatever</p> <p>18 they contain.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you relying on a paper called</p> <p>20 Harper 2023?</p> <p>21 A. I have read Harper. That's one of --</p> <p>22 if -- if you're going to ask me questions about</p> <p>23 it, could we just bring it up or --</p> <p>24 Q. Yeah, I'm -- all I've asked is: Are</p> <p>25 you relying on it?</p>	<p>Page 102</p> <p>1 A. As -- the only peer review comments</p> <p>2 that I would have seen are those from the papers</p> <p>3 on which I was a co-author.</p> <p>4 Q. And have you seen any correspondence</p> <p>5 or other materials related to the Woolen</p> <p>6 meta-analysis?</p> <p>7 A. Any correspondence? I don't recall</p> <p>8 seeing any.</p> <p>9 Q. I'll mark your 2023 report as</p> <p>10 Exhibit 6.</p> <p>11 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 6, Supplemental</p> <p>12 Expert Report of Patricia G. Moorman, MSPH,</p> <p>13 Ph.D., dated 11/15/23, was marked for</p> <p>14 identification.)</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. I'm marking as Exhibit 6 a</p> <p>17 supplemental expert report of Patricia G. Moorman,</p> <p>18 dated November 15th, 2023.</p> <p>19 So on Page 1 of your supplemental</p> <p>20 report dated November 2023, you say you considered</p> <p>21 the possible biases of -- of the various studies.</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Where can I find your analysis of the</p> <p>24 possible biases of the various studies?</p> <p>25 A. I -- I think that throughout the</p>
<p>1 A. I have read it. And, you know,</p> <p>2 it's -- as I recall, it's a laboratory study. And</p> <p>3 since my opinion is based primarily on the</p> <p>4 epidemiologic data, it's -- like, at a high level,</p> <p>5 I considered it. It was just part of what I read</p> <p>6 in forming my opinion.</p> <p>7 Q. But I can't find a discussion of it</p> <p>8 anywhere in your reports.</p> <p>9 A. No, I did -- my reports are focused</p> <p>10 primarily on the epidemiologic data, which is</p> <p>11 where my expertise is.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware that the peer-reviewed</p> <p>13 comments on Harper 2023 were produced in this</p> <p>14 litigation?</p> <p>15 A. I was not aware of that.</p> <p>16 Q. And you're also, presumably, not aware</p> <p>17 that some of the peer reviewers referred to that</p> <p>18 paper as outrageous?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I told you I have not</p> <p>21 seen any of that. I am unaware of any of</p> <p>22 that.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. In connection with this litigation,</p> <p>25 have you seen peer review comments for any papers?</p>	<p>Page 103</p> <p>1 report, I did address, you know, some of the</p> <p>2 potential biases. For example, in the O'Brien</p> <p>3 2023, I talked about how the underrepresentation</p> <p>4 of talc exposure in the Gonzalez paper, which was</p> <p>5 quantified in the O'Brien 2023 paper, really cast</p> <p>6 serious concerns about the Gonzalez paper.</p> <p>7 I -- in talking about the -- our own</p> <p>8 paper, the Davis paper, noted that the available</p> <p>9 data didn't allow for consideration of both</p> <p>10 frequency and duration.</p> <p>11 So throughout the report I think that</p> <p>12 there are numerous places where I did address some</p> <p>13 of the biases.</p> <p>14 Q. Is frequency and duration a bias or a</p> <p>15 limitation?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I would consider it more a</p> <p>17 limitation of the study.</p> <p>18 Q. So when you refer to bias here, you</p> <p>19 mean recall bias?</p> <p>20 A. It was not just recall bias, but</p> <p>21 misclassification bias as well.</p> <p>22 Q. And is misclassification a bias or a</p> <p>23 limitation?</p> <p>24 A. It -- it can be a bias, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And when you say possible biases here,</p>

<p>1 did you -- are you referring at all to author 2 bias? 3 A. My comment there was more in relation 4 to methodologic biases.</p> <p>5 Q. I wasn't sure.</p> <p>6 Are you familiar with the term 7 "cleavage fragment"?</p> <p>8 A. I'm sorry?</p> <p>9 Q. Are you familiar with the term 10 "cleavage fragment."</p> <p>11 A. "Cleavage fragment." Again, I believe 12 that I have seen that term in relation to some of 13 the talc analyses. But, again, that is not my 14 area of expertise.</p> <p>15 Q. So can we agree you're not offering an 16 opinion about cleavage fragments?</p> <p>17 A. That is correct.</p> <p>18 Q. That can save us a bunch of questions.</p> <p>19 A. Okay.</p> <p>20 Q. Are you offering an opinion as to 21 whether nonasbestiform tremolite can cause ovarian 22 cancer?</p> <p>23 A. I have already stated that my opinion 24 is based on the talc products, whatever is 25 contained in them.</p>	<p>Page 106</p> <p>1 have not offered an opinion about that.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you familiar with any scientific 3 papers that address amount of exposure to asbestos 4 that's needed to cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 6 answered.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Slightly different 8 question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Okay. In -- in general, 10 as I've stated previously, there is 11 considered -- asbestos is not considered to 12 have any safe level of exposure.</p> <p>13 I do not recall a paper that 14 specifically addressed the minimum level. 15 But in theory, it could be any level of 16 exposure to asbestos could cause ovarian 17 cancer.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Well, are you familiar with the term 20 "fibrous talc"?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, I have heard that term.</p> <p>22 Q. Are you aware of any literature 23 linking exposure to fibrous talc to the 24 development of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>25 A. The epidemiologic literature is</p>
<p>Page 107</p> <p>1 Q. Do you believe that background levels 2 of asbestos can cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: How do you define 5 "background levels"?</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether 8 nonoccupational exposure to asbestos can cause 9 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I did not specifically 12 offer that opinion. I am aware of 13 organizations, such as IARC, that have 14 concluded that occupational exposure can 15 cause -- to asbestos can cause ovarian 16 cancer.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. My question was about nonoccupational 19 exposure.</p> <p>20 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I 21 misunderstood you. Nonoccupational exposure to 22 asbestos? I did not offer an opinion about that 23 from the standpoint that numerous organizations 24 have stated that asbestos is a carcinogen and that 25 there is no safe level. It seems plausible, but I</p>	<p>Page 109</p> <p>1 addressing talc products. So whatever those 2 products contain, fibrous talc or any -- anything 3 else in those products, that is what is addressed 4 in the studies, and that's what informed my 5 opinions.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know what fibrous talc is?</p> <p>7 A. Again, you're getting more into the -- 8 the area of the people who are specialists in 9 minerals. I have read papers that have described 10 it, but it's certainly not my area of expertise.</p> <p>11 Q. I'm just asking, do you know what it 12 is?</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: I'm just going to object 14 to the extent this was thoroughly examined 15 at the time of her 2019 deposition.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know what -- 18 (Simultaneous talking.)</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Okay. So answer that, 20 what the definition is of fibrous talc. 21 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know what the -- what fibrous 24 talc is? That's simply my question. Do you know 25 what it is or not?</p>

<p>1 MS. PARFITT: Asked and answered.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: It wasn't answered.</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>4 answered.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Again, it is -- I have</p> <p>6 read some of the papers describing some of</p> <p>7 the mineral analyses, and I have seen that</p> <p>8 term repeatedly. I cannot actually</p> <p>9 describe, you know, fibrous talc from talc</p> <p>10 generally.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Have you published any papers on</p> <p>13 asbestos?</p> <p>14 A. No, I don't -- I don't believe I ever</p> <p>15 have.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you ever made any presentations,</p> <p>17 university, scientific groups, about asbestos?</p> <p>18 A. No, I have not.</p> <p>19 Q. Can you identify asbestos on a slide?</p> <p>20 A. No, I am not a laboratory scientist.</p> <p>21 That's just not -- that's outside my area of</p> <p>22 expertise.</p> <p>23 Q. Have you reviewed any J&J internal</p> <p>24 documents?</p> <p>25 A. Before my, I guess, 2019 deposition, I</p>	<p>Page 110</p> <p>1 Q. I'm able to skip a whole page. Who</p> <p>2 drafted your 2023 report?</p> <p>3 A. Who drafted it? I did.</p> <p>4 Q. Did the plaintiff's lawyer send you</p> <p>5 any of the scientific materials or you found them</p> <p>6 all yourself?</p> <p>7 A. I think that it was probably a</p> <p>8 combination. I think that nearly all of them I</p> <p>9 probably found myself. I believe that a report by</p> <p>10 Longo on asbestos -- his analysis of asbestos and</p> <p>11 talc, I believe that was one that was shared by</p> <p>12 counsel.</p> <p>13 Q. I assume you're familiar with a paper</p> <p>14 called "Davis 2021"?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you disclose that you were a</p> <p>17 plaintiff's expert in conjunction with that paper?</p> <p>18 A. I disclosed that I was being paid --</p> <p>19 that I was involved in talc litigation and was</p> <p>20 being paid for that -- talc -- talc --</p> <p>21 Q. Why didn't you disclose which side</p> <p>22 you're on?</p> <p>23 A. When I first started -- became</p> <p>24 involved in this, this was the first time I've</p> <p>25 ever had to disclose anything. The phrasing that</p>
<p>1 did see some documents that were shared with me,</p> <p>2 some of it discussing some analyses of asbestos --</p> <p>3 asbestos in the talc products.</p> <p>4 Q. Those are documents shared with you by</p> <p>5 plaintiff's counsel?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: Actually, they were J&J</p> <p>7 documents, but --</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah.</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: -- I believe so.</p> <p>10 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah.</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: And they're listed,</p> <p>12 again, on her 20 --</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: On the original --</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: -- 2018 report --</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: -- and examined --</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: -- in 2019.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. All right. So maybe a better way to</p> <p>22 just move on past this whole topic is: Since your</p> <p>23 deposition in 2019, have you looked at any J&J</p> <p>24 company documents?</p> <p>25 A. No, I don't believe I have.</p>	<p>Page 111</p> <p>1 I typically use has something along the lines of:</p> <p>2 I have received compensation from law firms in</p> <p>3 relation to the talc and ovarian cancer</p> <p>4 litigation. I have submitted that to the journal.</p> <p>5 And I have never had any pushback from the journal</p> <p>6 editors about that phrasing, and so that's what I</p> <p>7 have stuck with.</p> <p>8 Q. So does the disclosure to Davis make</p> <p>9 clear that you've received money in connection</p> <p>10 with the talc litigation?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, it does.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you tell the journal that you were</p> <p>13 a paid plaintiff's expert in talc litigation?</p> <p>14 A. I used the phrasing that I said, that</p> <p>15 I have received -- something to the effect that I</p> <p>16 have received compensation for work in relation to</p> <p>17 the talc and ovarian cancer litigation.</p> <p>18 I was not asked by the journal editors</p> <p>19 to be more explicit. That's what I -- and so I</p> <p>20 assume that that was an acceptable disclosure from</p> <p>21 the standpoint of the editors.</p> <p>22 Q. And who wrote the author's</p> <p>23 disclosures, you or the paper -- or the journal?</p> <p>24 A. We -- I -- there are two versions of</p> <p>25 the paper, and I -- in the published version, that</p>
	<p>Page 113</p>

<p>1 was what the journal wrote. And then there is the 2 HHS public access version, which is the final 3 submitted manuscript, and that one is -- has the 4 phrasing that I believe that I submitted with this 5 article.</p> <p>6 Q. So you're saying there's two different 7 author disclosures in two different versions of 8 this article?</p> <p>9 A. Yeah. So if you -- I mean, I don't 10 know that we have both versions of it, but I know 11 that the -- the phrasing in the published -- 12 published version is not phrasing that I have ever 13 used. And going back to the HHS public access 14 version, it has the phrasing that I typically 15 used.</p> <p>16 Q. Understood.</p> <p>17 Do you think that the fact that you're 18 a paid plaintiff's expert should affect the 19 grading or weight assigned to your study?</p> <p>20 A. As I explained earlier, the -- an 21 informed reader of that paper would look at it and 22 they should evaluate, as they would no matter who 23 the authors are, are there any issues with 24 methodology, interpretation or whatever.</p> <p>25 I also think that an informed reader</p>	<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 paper, "Genital Powder Use and Risk of Epithelial 2 Ovarian Cancer in the Ovarian Cancer in Women of 3 African Ancestry Consortium."</p> <p>4 And if you look at Table 3, the OR --</p> <p>5 A. Okay. I'm going to -- let's see.</p> <p>6 This -- I have --</p> <p>7 Q. We just need to put a sticker on it.</p> <p>8 This is 7.</p> <p>9 A. Okay. I want to -- if you're looking 10 at that version, I want to look at it because the 11 one I have in my notebook is the public access 12 version. Okay. So...</p> <p>13 Q. Let's just finish this question, and 14 then we'll take a break.</p> <p>15 A. Okay.</p> <p>16 Q. I think where we were was that the -- 17 according to Table 3, right?</p> <p>18 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>19 Q. The OR.</p> <p>20 A. Right. Go ahead with your question, 21 please.</p> <p>22 Q. For African-American women who had 23 ever used a body powder in genital areas and the 24 development of ovarian cancer is not statistically 25 significant, correct?</p>
<p>Page 115</p> <p>1 would look at this particular paper and would see 2 that 1 of approximately 15 authors had this 3 disclosure. I was neither the first author nor 4 the senior author on this paper. So I would think 5 that an informed reader would say that it probably 6 had little to no effect on how the data were 7 analyzed and interpreted.</p> <p>8 Q. The Davis paper did not find a 9 statistically significant association between talc 10 use by African-American women and the development 11 of ovarian cancer, right?</p> <p>12 A. Once again, let me just pull that 13 paper up.</p> <p>14 Q. Sure.</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: We can mark -- let's 16 mark Davis as Exhibit 7.</p> <p>17 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 7, AACR - Genital 18 Powder Use and Risk of Epithelial Ovarian 19 Cancer in the Ovarian Cancer in Women of 20 African Ancestry Consortium, was marked for 21 identification.)</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. Let me just read the full title for 24 the record. We're marking as Exhibit 7 a 2021 25 paper. First author, C.P. Davis. Title of the</p>	<p>Page 116</p> <p>1 A. They report -- we reported an odds 2 ratio of 1.22 with a confidence interval from 3 1. -- or, rather, .97 to 1.53. So it was elevated 4 risk that was not statistically significant.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you state in your 2023 expert 6 report that Davis did not find a statistically 7 significant association for African-American 8 women?</p> <p>9 A. I recorded the values as reported.</p> <p>10 Increased risk of ovarian cancer among the entire 11 studied population for African-American women and 12 for white women, and the confidence intervals are 13 reported there. So, yes, an informed reader will 14 know whether or not those were statistically 15 significant or not.</p> <p>16 Q. Do African-American women use genital 17 talc more frequently than white women?</p> <p>18 A. That has been recorded in a number of 19 studies, yes, that --</p> <p>20 Q. Did Davis find a dose-response?</p> <p>21 A. As I stated in my report, based on 22 broad categorizations of either frequency or 23 duration, they did not -- we did not report a 24 dose-response. However, in the paper, we did note 25 that we did not -- because of the availability of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 data from the various studies, we did not have a 2 measure of both frequency and duration that would 3 allow the most accurate measure of dose.</p> <p>4 Q. But just to be clear, there was no 5 dose-response either for duration or for 6 frequency, right?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 8 answered.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I -- I just answered 10 that for you. I mean, maybe you could read 11 back my response. I --</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. You agree that there was no finding of 14 a dose-response either for duration or frequency, 15 correct?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 17 answered.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Like I said, I did -- I 19 did state that in my previous answer.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. It was lost in the long answer. So I 22 just want to make sure I have the record clear.</p> <p>23 A. Okay. Once again, we did not find a 24 dose-response for frequency or duration as I noted 25 in my report based on broad categorizations.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 and stamp at the same time. So that's why 2 I did the title first.</p> <p>3 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 8, Effects of risk 4 factors for ovarian cancer in women with 5 and without endometriosis, was marked for 6 identification.)</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Dr. Moorman, you're familiar with this 9 paper, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>11 Q. Are you familiar with any of the 12 authors on here?</p> <p>13 A. I have met many of them over the 14 years.</p> <p>15 Q. Who is Daniel Cramer?</p> <p>16 A. Daniel Cramer, he's an ovarian cancer 17 epidemiologist. He's also a medical doctor. He 18 was the one who published probably the first 19 epidemiologic study noting an association -- 20 increased risk of ovarian cancer with talc use. 21 And I understand that he is also a plaintiff 22 witness.</p> <p>23 Q. Does this paper indicate somewhere 24 that Dr. Cramer is a plaintiff expert?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. In the acknowledgments.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Let's go off the 2 record.</p> <p>3 * * *</p> <p>4 (Whereupon, there was a luncheon 5 recess in the proceedings from 12:10 p.m. 6 to 12:59 p.m.)</p> <p>7 * * *</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. So we're going to go to your 2023 10 report, which is Exhibit 6, and we had started 11 talking about that. And I believe we talked about 12 Davis.</p> <p>13 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>14 Q. And just to reorient us, I had a few 15 questions about a paper called Phung 2022.</p> <p>16 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 Q. We can mark that, M.T. Phung, et 18 al. --</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: I believe it's 20 Exhibit 8.</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. I'm about to say 22 that, 8. "Effects of risk factors for 23 ovarian cancer in women with and without 24 endometriosis." I'm going to mark it as 25 Exhibit 8. Our court reporter can't type</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 Q. What does it say?</p> <p>2 A. Wait. I'm sorry. He reports payment 3 for expert testimony from Ferraro Law Firm and 4 Ashbrook [sic] -- Ashcraft & Gerel law firm in 5 grant funding.</p> <p>6 Q. And does this paper indicate that that 7 payment involves talc litigation?</p> <p>8 A. No, it does not.</p> <p>9 Q. And does it indicate whether he is an 10 expert for the plaintiff side or the defense side?</p> <p>11 A. No, it does not state that in that 12 disclosure.</p> <p>13 Q. So the average person reading this 14 paper wouldn't know that Dr. Cramer is a 15 plaintiff's expert, correct?</p> <p>16 A. No, they would not know that from that 17 statement.</p> <p>18 Q. And what's an open access article?</p> <p>19 A. An open access --</p> <p>20 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>21 A. -- article? Just as the name implies, 22 that it is available to -- to anyone, that it does 23 not require a subscription to the journal.</p> <p>24 Q. Is there a difference between open 25 access journals and other journals?</p>

<p>1 A. Well, getting into a bit of it, for 2 some journals that are not open access, if you 3 want to access one of their articles, you either 4 have to be a subscriber or you have to pay a fee 5 for the article.</p> <p>6 There is an NIH requirement that if -- 7 work that is funded by NIH funding has to be 8 available in this -- as they describe here, the 9 HHS public access, meaning that it's freely 10 available.</p> <p>11 Q. Do open access journals have the same 12 publication standards as other journals?</p> <p>13 A. I mean, you're talking about a whole 14 range of journals, and there's a range of 15 standards with -- within every journal. But 16 generally, open access journals, speaking in very 17 general terms, they would go through a peer review 18 process, just like a non-open access journal.</p> <p>19 Q. Got it. I just didn't know.</p> <p>20 Have you ever spoken with Dr. Cramer?</p> <p>21 A. Yeah, I have. Not in quite a few 22 years, but I have spoken to him in the past.</p> <p>23 Q. About this litigation?</p> <p>24 A. Never about this litigation.</p> <p>25 Q. Have you ever spoken to any of</p>	<p>Page 122</p> <p>1 Q. Is a family history of ovarian cancer 2 considered to be a risk factor for ovarian cancer?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. You asked only about family 4 history, but a family history of ovarian cancer is 5 a risk factor -- is considered a risk factor.</p> <p>6 Q. If you look at Table 2 of the Phung 7 paper, what's the reported odds ratio for 8 first-degree family history of ovarian cancer with 9 endometriosis?</p> <p>10 A. So -- okay. The printing on this 11 version of it is a little wonky. That's why 12 it's taking a minute.</p> <p>13 So among women with endometriosis, 14 those that have a first-degree family history of 15 ovarian cancer, the odds ratio is 1.58.</p> <p>16 Q. And what about for first-degree 17 history of ovarian cancer without endometriosis?</p> <p>18 A. For them, the odds ratio is 2.20.</p> <p>19 Q. So just to make sure I understand, 20 does this paper report a higher odds ratio for 21 family history without endometriosis?</p> <p>22 A. Yes. The -- the point estimate is 23 among women without a -- who did not report a 24 history of endometriosis, the odds ratio for a 25 family -- first-degree family history of ovarian</p>
<p>1 plaintiff's experts about this litigation?</p> <p>2 A. No. Not to my knowledge, no.</p> <p>3 Q. Have you ever spoken to any of your 4 professional colleagues about this litigation?</p> <p>5 A. I have spoken to several of my 6 colleagues that I am involved in it. I have not 7 discussed really any of the specifics of it, you 8 know, like not going through articles and 9 expressing my opinion or asking their opinion 10 about any articles. It's always been in very 11 general terms of this is something that I am 12 doing.</p> <p>13 Q. And is the involvement of a 14 plaintiff's expert one factor that you consider in 15 weighing the reliability of an article?</p> <p>16 A. Again, as we discussed, when looking 17 at whether or not there is any potential conflicts 18 of interest, it's like, sure, it's something that 19 you might consider. But what really drives it is 20 that -- the same thing that drives any evaluation 21 of an article, mainly just looking at the 22 methodology and -- and the interpretations.</p> <p>23 Q. Is family history a risk factor for 24 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>25 A. You need to be more specific.</p>	<p>Page 123</p> <p>1 cancer was 2.20. And for women with 2 endometriosis, they reported 1.58. And you can 3 see there's considerable overlap in the confidence 4 intervals --</p> <p>5 Q. Why is the overlap in the confidence 6 intervals relevant?</p> <p>7 A. It's -- so their best estimate of that 8 association is what's reported in the point 9 estimate, the odds ratio. And then the confidence 10 intervals gives a range of values with which the 11 data are statistically compatible.</p> <p>12 And so one way to think about it is, 13 like, if you repeated the experiment many times, 14 you might come up with a slightly higher estimate 15 or a slightly lower estimate. But you can see 16 that the confidence intervals overlap. So there's 17 a lot of overlap in the range of values for which 18 the data are statistically compatible.</p> <p>19 Q. Got it.</p> <p>20 And that's the same thing we found in 21 O'Brien for the hazard ratio for patent and 22 nonpatent women, right?</p> <p>23 A. That there was -- yes, I did 24 acknowledge that there was considerable overlap in 25 those odds ratios.</p>

<p>1 Q. Is there any reason why having 2 endometriosis would cause the known risk factor of 3 first-degree family history for ovarian cancer to 4 become attenuated?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: One could -- I think -- 7 let me start again.</p> <p>8 I cannot think of a reason of that -- 9 why that would be the case, but I think 10 that this is just possibly reflecting 11 some -- a little bit of random variation. 12 It's -- you know, in this particular study, 13 they found an odds ratio of 1.58 among 14 women who had a history of endometriosis. 15 In other studies, it might be a bit lower 16 or a bit higher.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. So you're saying, rather than 19 endometriosis protecting you from ovarian cancer 20 when you have a family risk, this may just be a 21 numbers issue?</p> <p>22 A. It may be a numbers issue. It may be 23 some biological mechanism of which I am unaware.</p> <p>24 Q. Could you turn to Table 1? Are you 25 looking at Supplementary Table 1?</p>	<p>Page 126</p> <p>1 Q. Is it your typical practice to look at 2 supplemental tables when you review a study? 3 A. I often do, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. I'm looking at these 5 supplemental tables. And if you go down to 6 "Talc use," Page 2, it shows talc use, genital 7 use, never, nongenital use, and then it says 8 missing, right?</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. And as I read it, there's a lot of 11 data missing on talc use, right?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. In every column, it's somewhere around 14 40 percent, right?</p> <p>15 A. That is correct.</p> <p>16 Q. So both for cases/controls with 17 endometriosis, without endometriosis, there's a 18 lot of missing information there, right?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: They report -- yes, they 21 report missing values of roughly 40 22 percent.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. And if you look at the supplemental 25 table -- they call it "Supplementary Table" -- for</p>
<p>1 A. I didn't realize you said 2 "supplementary."</p> <p>3 Q. I probably screwed up. I apologize.</p> <p>4 A. Okay. This -- the version that you 5 provided to me does not -- does not have 6 Supplemental Table --</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Asher, can we mark 8 Supplemental Table 1 of Phung as -- as our 9 next exhibit. I didn't realize it wasn't 10 stapled to the back.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: So we're marking 13 Supplemental Tables 2 Phung as Exhibit 14 Number --</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: 9.</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: -- as Exhibit Number 9.</p> <p>17 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 9, Supplemental Table 18 1 and 2 Phung, was marked for 19 identification.)</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. Did you look at these supplementary 22 tables when you reviewed Phung?</p> <p>23 A. I did.</p> <p>24 Q. You did?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I did.</p>	<p>Page 127</p> <p>1 each characteristic, they tell you how much data 2 are missing, right?</p> <p>3 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>4 Q. And there's a percentage for each 5 characteristic. And talc is, by far, the one with 6 the highest amount of missing data; is that 7 correct?</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know why so much data are 12 missing?</p> <p>13 A. I would presume that there may have 14 been some of the included studies that did not 15 include that question on their questionnaire.</p> <p>16 Q. Did -- did the volume of missing data 17 affect in any way your analysis of this paper?</p> <p>18 A. It -- it really did not because it 19 would -- within that subset of women who had 20 missing data, it would not have differed; like, 21 you know, the cases were reporting it, and the 22 controls were not. I don't think that there was 23 any difference. I think that is -- there just 24 might have been some studies that did not ask 25 about --</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Q. So -- so when you discussed Phung in 2 your paper -- in your report -- in your 2023 3 supplemental report, you don't mention that 4 there's -- approximately 40 percent of the data 5 were missing, right?</p> <p>6 A. No. I think that's a 7 mischaracterization. It's not missing -- not a 8 huge amount of missing data from a single study, 9 which might raise some different concerns. 10 It's -- apparently, there were just some studies 11 that did not have that data available or -- or 12 perhaps in a form that was compatible with how the 13 others collected it.</p> <p>14 Q. My question was just simply: You 15 don't address Supplemental Table 1 and the missing 16 data in your report, correct?</p> <p>17 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>21 Can we go back to O'Brien 2020, which 22 I believe is Exhibit 2. You commented in your 23 paper -- in your report that women who had ovarian 24 cancer prior to baseline were excluded, right? Do 25 you recall discussing that in your report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 Q. So is it fair to say that was just -- 2 that sentence was just -- was that sentence 3 speculative?</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: What I was pointing out 6 with that statement is that -- potential 7 limitations of studies. And a potential 8 limitation of this study, the Women's 9 Health Initiative, the -- the women were 63 10 years old on average when they were 11 enrolled in the cohort. And so it is a 12 potential concern. That's what I was 13 pointing out.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. And is that a potential concern for 16 the NHS studies or the sister study?</p> <p>17 A. It's actually a concern for -- for -- 18 for all of them. I mean, that's across the board. 19 It's like, you know, from the point that -- you 20 know, as we often do, we have some concerns about 21 potential limitations of the study and all of 22 these -- and to some -- I mean, the Women's Health 23 Initiative is the most extreme where the -- the 24 age of the cohort was the oldest. But it's a 25 concern with -- with all of them to some extent.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 A. I did.</p> <p>2 Q. And you state in your report: If talc 3 use is more strongly associated with ovarian 4 cancer diagnosed at younger ages, the use of 5 cohorts of older women would be less able to 6 detect such an association.</p> <p>7 Do you recall saying that?</p> <p>8 A. I do.</p> <p>9 Q. Can you point to any studies that show 10 that talc is more strongly associated with ovarian 11 cancer diagnosed at younger ages?</p> <p>12 A. I believe that -- just one moment. I 13 recall that one of the papers that Dan Cramer was 14 a co-author on -- and I'm not sure exactly which 15 one it was, but -- did report a stronger 16 association for premenopausal women.</p> <p>17 Q. Are you offering an opinion in this 18 litigation that talc use is more strongly 19 associated with ovarian cancer diagnosed at 20 younger ages?</p> <p>21 A. I am not offering any opinion in that 22 regard.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Then we don't have to talk 24 about it anymore.</p> <p>25 A. Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 Q. What are the strengths of the O'Brien 2 paper?</p> <p>3 A. So some of the strengths of it are 4 that it does have a pretty large sample size. 5 It's generally the -- the studies were 6 well-conducted studies by, you know, strong 7 investigators, although none of them were actually 8 designed specifically to address ovarian cancer. 9 And so as in cohort studies in 10 general, they're able to address a lot of 11 different risk factors. But in general, they tend 12 to get -- have less detail on some of the 13 exposures.</p> <p>14 So like any cohort studies, there are 15 some strengths in terms of the sample size, the 16 fact that the data were collected before the 17 diagnosis of -- of ovarian cancer. But then those 18 are balanced with some of the limitations of any 19 cohort study as well.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you list in your report any -- do 21 you have a section in your report where you list 22 the strengths of the O'Brien paper?</p> <p>23 A. I did not specifically.</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Let's talk about 25 Woolen 2022. Let's mark that paper as</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 Exhibit 10. Exhibit 10. And the title of 2 the paper is S.A. Woolen, et al., 3 "Association Between the Frequent Use of 4 Perineal Talcum Powder Products and Ovarian 5 Cancer: a Systematic Review and 6 Meta-analysis. 2022.</p> <p>7 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 10, Association 8 Between the Frequent Use of Perineal Talcum 9 Powder Products and Ovarian Cancer: a 10 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis, was 11 marked for identification.)</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Are you familiar with any of the 14 authors of the Woolen paper?</p> <p>15 A. I don't believe that I've ever met any 16 of them in person.</p> <p>17 Q. Who is the senior author?</p> <p>18 A. The last author is Rebecca 19 Smith-Bindman.</p> <p>20 Q. And have you heard her name before you 21 read this paper?</p> <p>22 A. I believe that I have read some of her 23 other work, and I understand that she is an expert 24 in this litigation.</p> <p>25 Q. Have you read her expert -- any of her</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Again, what I know about 2 it is what's in this article, and I don't 3 believe there was any mention of that.</p> <p>4 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>5 Q. Would the fact that Dr. Woolen 6 received Dr. Smith-Bindman's litigation report 7 before setting out to do this study affect your 8 grading or weighting of the study's quality?</p> <p>9 A. Again, it's -- knowing that one of the 10 authors was a plaintiff's expert, certainly what 11 it does is it just makes me evaluate the 12 methodology, and was there anything that I found 13 particularly concerning about the methodology or 14 the interpretation. That's how I would take that 15 knowledge into consideration.</p> <p>16 Q. At the top of this paper, the 17 background says: Risk of ovarian cancer in women 18 with frequent perineal talcum powder product use 19 is not well understood.</p> <p>20 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: You're referencing the 22 background?</p> <p>23 MS. DAVIDSON: The very first 24 sentence.</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: She's looking at that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 expert reports in this litigation?</p> <p>2 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>3 Q. Are you aware that this meta-analysis 4 stemmed from her expert report?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I do not. I mean, all I 7 know about this report is what's in the 8 paper. There's no mention of that, to my 9 knowledge, in the paper. I don't recall 10 that being mentioned.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. So you didn't know she did a 13 meta-analysis for the litigation?</p> <p>14 A. I don't recall reading a report -- her 15 report, so I don't know what she did or did not 16 do.</p> <p>17 Q. So I take it you didn't compare the 18 Woolen paper to the meta-analysis she did in the 19 litigation?</p> <p>20 A. No, I don't. I -- I don't recall 21 reading a report from her.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know that Dr. Woolen received 23 Dr. Smith-Bindman's litigation report before 24 beginning this paper?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 Thank you.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I think that the 3 modifier the -- frequent perineal talcum 4 powder use, the "frequent" is the modifier. 5 And I think that that's what they were 6 trying to get at, that there has not been a 7 systematic review that focused on frequent 8 use.</p> <p>9 So from the standpoint that it's not 10 well understood, there have not been a lot 11 of data. At least they have not been 12 combined into a systematic review like 13 that.</p> <p>14 So I -- I can see where they're coming 15 from, and I think that it's a fair 16 statement for what they're getting at.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. How did the authors decide to define 19 "frequent use" as 2 times -- at least 2 times per 20 week?</p> <p>21 A. They do not describe their reasoning 22 for it. They define what they, you know -- like 23 any paper, you make decisions about what you're 24 going to analyze, and you just need to be -- just 25 lay it out. This is what she did. And they</p>

<p>1 didn't explain why they set that cut point.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you aware of any papers prior to</p> <p>3 Woolen that defined frequent powder use</p> <p>4 differently than at least 2 times per week?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Generally, papers would</p> <p>7 have some -- if they had some measure of</p> <p>8 frequency, they would just lay out the</p> <p>9 categories what they had, you know, if it</p> <p>10 was once a week or how many times per</p> <p>11 month, you know, one time a month, you</p> <p>12 know, five to ten times a month or</p> <p>13 whatever. I don't think that it's typical</p> <p>14 to say -- to say this is frequent; this is</p> <p>15 infrequent.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Well, this paper says that more than 2</p> <p>18 times a week is frequent, right?</p> <p>19 A. That's how they defined it. And like</p> <p>20 I said, when you do an analysis, they are just</p> <p>21 saying how they defined this exposure. Frequent</p> <p>22 use defined as.</p> <p>23 And, you know, another person might</p> <p>24 disagree with, no, that's infrequent or that's not</p> <p>25 frequent enough. But as long as the authors are</p>	<p>Page 138</p> <p>1 transparent, I think, about what they -- what they</p> <p>2 defined.</p> <p>3 Q. Right. But my question simply is</p> <p>4 just: Are you aware of any papers that have a</p> <p>5 different cut point for frequency?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>7 answered.</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: No, it hasn't been</p> <p>9 answered.</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: I believe it has.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I don't -- I -- what I</p> <p>12 have answered repeatedly is that,</p> <p>13 typically, when they talk about frequency,</p> <p>14 they give the categories that they used. I</p> <p>15 don't -- I don't think that it is very</p> <p>16 common to say frequent or infrequent. They</p> <p>17 just report the categories they used.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. But this paper reports frequent or</p> <p>20 infrequent, right?</p> <p>21 A. They -- they are -- they describe what</p> <p>22 they hoped to do, to look at use among more</p> <p>23 frequent users. Then they had to set a cut</p> <p>24 point --</p> <p>25 Q. Right.</p>
<p>1 clear on what -- what they're defining it as, it's</p> <p>2 easy to interpret the data, and it's fair to</p> <p>3 interpret the data like that.</p> <p>4 Q. I think you didn't understand my</p> <p>5 question, which was: Are you familiar with any</p> <p>6 other talc literature in this body of literature</p> <p>7 that we're discussing here today that defined</p> <p>8 "frequent use" differently?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Excuse me.</p> <p>10 Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I believe that I've</p> <p>12 answered your question. They don't</p> <p>13 typically say this is frequent; this is</p> <p>14 infrequent. They just put the categories</p> <p>15 of use when they're talking about</p> <p>16 frequency.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. These authors say frequent, right?</p> <p>19 Frequent is at least 2 times per week, right?</p> <p>20 A. And that is the decision that they</p> <p>21 made. They wanted to look at women who were using</p> <p>22 it more frequently, what -- and they delineated</p> <p>23 the cut point that they used and -- so, again,</p> <p>24 it's -- a different set of investigators might</p> <p>25 have defined it differently. But they're being</p>	<p>Page 139</p> <p>1 A. -- because there would be -- and so</p> <p>2 they -- they put it out there that what they</p> <p>3 wanted to look at are those women who had used it</p> <p>4 2 or more times per week.</p> <p>5 Q. Right. Totally agree. And I'm</p> <p>6 asking: Are there any other papers in this whole</p> <p>7 body of literature that also defined "frequent"</p> <p>8 with a cut point but use a different cut point?</p> <p>9 That's all I'm asking.</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall --</p> <p>11 Q. Okay.</p> <p>12 A. -- anyone -- I -- I just don't recall</p> <p>13 any people -- I don't recall people defining</p> <p>14 frequent, infrequent, like -- they just report the</p> <p>15 categories of frequency of use. That's what I</p> <p>16 recall from the papers.</p> <p>17 Q. So this is the only paper that you can</p> <p>18 think of that has a cut point for the use of the</p> <p>19 word "frequent"?</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>21 her testimony.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: What they were doing</p> <p>23 there is they wanted to set, basically, a</p> <p>24 minimum level --</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>

<p>1 Q. Right.</p> <p>2 A. -- of frequency of use.</p> <p>3 Q. Right.</p> <p>4 A. And they just put it out there. And I</p> <p>5 think -- I think it's fine. It's -- it's --</p> <p>6 Q. No, I know you think it's fine. I'm</p> <p>7 just asking whether you know whether any other</p> <p>8 papers define "frequent" with a different cut</p> <p>9 point. That's all I'm asking.</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Again, objection. It's</p> <p>11 been asked, and it's been answered</p> <p>12 exhaustively. I'm not sure she can answer</p> <p>13 better.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I -- I truly do not -- I</p> <p>15 think I've answered the question about</p> <p>16 three times already.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. And the answer is, no, you don't know</p> <p>19 of another paper that uses the term "frequent"</p> <p>20 with a different cut point?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. That's not</p> <p>22 her testimony. Misstates.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. So it's a "yes" or "no."</p> <p>25 A. What I --</p>	<p>Page 142</p> <p>1 what you do with a meta-analysis.</p> <p>2 And with selection of studies, a</p> <p>3 different investigator might make a different</p> <p>4 decision. But it's -- these -- the results</p> <p>5 they're presenting here are the results from</p> <p>6 studies that reported frequent use defined as that</p> <p>7 minimum level.</p> <p>8 And, you know, so the results should</p> <p>9 be appropriate for studies that met that inclusion</p> <p>10 criteria. And I wouldn't consider that skewing</p> <p>11 the results.</p> <p>12 Q. My question simply was: Is there a</p> <p>13 risk that authors of a meta-analysis can skew the</p> <p>14 results based on how they define inclusion</p> <p>15 criteria --</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. -- generally?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: If someone did not do a</p> <p>21 meta-analysis according to typical</p> <p>22 standards, and they did some very</p> <p>23 outrageous exclusion or inclusion of</p> <p>24 studies, they could skew the results.</p> <p>25 But when it's laid out how they did</p>
<p>1 MS. PARFITT: It's neither.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: What I have stated is,</p> <p>3 what I typically recall from the papers is</p> <p>4 they report the categories of frequency.</p> <p>5 And I don't recall papers saying this is</p> <p>6 frequent; this is infrequent. This is</p> <p>7 basically their inclusion criteria for the</p> <p>8 studies that they wanted to include for the</p> <p>9 purpose of looking at women who had used</p> <p>10 talc more frequently.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Is the reliability of a meta-analysis</p> <p>13 contingent on proper selection of studies and</p> <p>14 datasets?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And fair to say that the authors of a</p> <p>17 meta-analysis can skew the results based on</p> <p>18 selection of studies -- right?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. -- based on how they select studies?</p> <p>22 A. It is important for authors to be</p> <p>23 transparent about the inclusion criteria that they</p> <p>24 set out. They go through and they describe what</p> <p>25 they did, and it's a pretty typical description of</p>	<p>Page 143</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: It's neither.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: What I have stated is,</p> <p>3 what I typically recall from the papers is</p> <p>4 they report the categories of frequency.</p> <p>5 And I don't recall papers saying this is</p> <p>6 frequent; this is infrequent. This is</p> <p>7 basically their inclusion criteria for the</p> <p>8 studies that they wanted to include for the</p> <p>9 purpose of looking at women who had used</p> <p>10 talc more frequently.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. So is it your testimony that as long</p> <p>13 as the authors state their inclusion criteria,</p> <p>14 there's no concern that they are skewing results</p> <p>15 based on the decisions they're making?</p> <p>16 A. What I am saying is, I don't really</p> <p>17 like the phrasing "skewing the results." Like,</p> <p>18 they're making a decision to define "frequency" as</p> <p>19 at least 2 times -- 2 or more times per week.</p> <p>20 Someone else might disagree with that and say, no,</p> <p>21 frequent use has to be at least 5 times a week.</p> <p>22 And that's not skewing the results. It's just,</p> <p>23 like -- it's making a decision.</p> <p>24 And then it's -- if they're following</p> <p>25 the normal, standard procedures for doing a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 Q. What's the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale?</p> <p>2 A. It is one of several scales that --</p> <p>3 that are sometimes used in meta-analyses to rate</p> <p>4 the quality of studies. There are a number of</p> <p>5 criteria that can be applied. And basically, it</p> <p>6 gives you -- can give you an idea of some of the</p> <p>7 studies that are perhaps stronger and some that</p> <p>8 are weaker by the criteria they lay out.</p> <p>9 Q. Is that -- is it objective or</p> <p>10 subjective?</p> <p>11 A. It is -- it's truly both. You come up</p> <p>12 with a number, but it is -- which sounds</p> <p>13 subjective. But along the way it's sometimes</p> <p>14 difficult to say, you know, did they do a good job</p> <p>15 on selection, or did they adequately control for</p> <p>16 confounding?</p> <p>17 And so, you know, someone might say,</p> <p>18 well, they controlled for confounding, but they</p> <p>19 didn't control for all the possible confounders.</p> <p>20 So there is some subjectivity in the -- applying</p> <p>21 the criteria. And so you use a somewhat</p> <p>22 subjective criteria, and you wind up with a number</p> <p>23 that is somewhat objective.</p> <p>24 Q. If you look at Table 1, which study</p> <p>25 receives the highest score?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 also used the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale?</p> <p>2 A. I didn't recall that specifically, no.</p> <p>3 Q. And did you compare the scores that</p> <p>4 Woolen gave to these studies versus the scores</p> <p>5 that Taher gave these studies?</p> <p>6 A. I did not.</p> <p>7 Q. If you look at the Whittenmore paper</p> <p>8 here, you can see that Woolen and Smith-Bindman</p> <p>9 give the Whittenmore study a score of 8 -- a 7,</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I do see that.</p> <p>12 Q. Does that 7 connote a strong study?</p> <p>13 A. I mean, it's -- I think that it</p> <p>14 connotes a study that is overall pretty good, but</p> <p>15 some limitations as well. There's no perfect</p> <p>16 study.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know why Woolen would have</p> <p>18 assigned higher ratings to most of the</p> <p>19 case-control studies than Taher did?</p> <p>20 A. I wouldn't know that. As I said,</p> <p>21 there is some subjectivity in applying each of the</p> <p>22 criteria scores, and so it would not be completely</p> <p>23 out of question that different evaluators might be</p> <p>24 more rigid or more lenient.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you have a view as to whether these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 A. It was the data from the Nurses'</p> <p>2 Health Study.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you agree with that assessment?</p> <p>4 A. I -- I'm -- you know, I have never --</p> <p>5 I think that the Nurses' Health Study is a</p> <p>6 well-designed study overall. I think that it's</p> <p>7 generally a strong study, but it does have</p> <p>8 limitations. And then the difference between that</p> <p>9 and then the 8s for most of the case-control</p> <p>10 studies, all of that means they're pretty --</p> <p>11 they're good studies.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you recall any other paper that you</p> <p>13 reviewed in this litigation that also used</p> <p>14 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale?</p> <p>15 A. I'm not -- I mean, the</p> <p>16 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale is one of several scales</p> <p>17 that are -- have been used in meta-analysis to</p> <p>18 assess study quality.</p> <p>19 And, you know, I have reviewed several</p> <p>20 meta-analyses in the course of reviewing all of</p> <p>21 this. And I do not recall which used</p> <p>22 Newcastle-Ottawa's Scale, which used maybe the</p> <p>23 Cochrane Scale, and I think there are several</p> <p>24 others. So I just --</p> <p>25 Q. So you don't recall that Taher 2019</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 scores provided by Woolen under the</p> <p>2 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale are more or less reliable</p> <p>3 than the very different scores that are in the</p> <p>4 Taher paper?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know what</p> <p>7 the thought process was for either set of</p> <p>8 investigators. You know, I -- I do know</p> <p>9 from using similar scales that there is</p> <p>10 some subjectivity in it, and it's not</p> <p>11 necessarily reflecting any bias on the part</p> <p>12 of the investigator. But it's -- sometimes</p> <p>13 it's just hard to get the information</p> <p>14 because it might not be well reported in</p> <p>15 some paper. I don't know what their</p> <p>16 thought processes were.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. If we could turn to Page 2531. At the</p> <p>19 bottom of Page 2531, the Woolen paper states that</p> <p>20 the studies were of high quality. Do you see</p> <p>21 that? Right at the end of Page 2531. Almost at</p> <p>22 the end of that page. 2531. Right at the bottom.</p> <p>23 Under "Strengths."</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. The author states: the included</p>

<p>1 studies were of high quality.</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. That's very different from what Taher</p> <p>5 said, correct?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure exactly</p> <p>8 what statement you're referring to in the</p> <p>9 Taher report.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Have you forgotten that we discussed</p> <p>12 right before lunch that Taher said the quality of</p> <p>13 the evidence was very low?</p> <p>14 A. You're talking about two different</p> <p>15 things here. This is -- that is not talking to</p> <p>16 the quality of individual studies.</p> <p>17 Q. You don't think Taher was talking</p> <p>18 about the quality of the individual studies?</p> <p>19 A. I think that he was talking about some</p> <p>20 of the limitations in the -- but I think that it's</p> <p>21 not a direct apples-to-apples comparison. I think</p> <p>22 that it is possible to have high-quality studies</p> <p>23 that still have some limitations.</p> <p>24 Q. But Taher gave lower points on the</p> <p>25 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale to all these studies. Is</p>	<p>Page 150</p> <p>1 women?</p> <p>2 A. Right offhand, I don't know -- I don't</p> <p>3 know.</p> <p>4 Q. So you don't know what, if any,</p> <p>5 publications they were trying to harmonize to,</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>8 Q. Did O'Brien provide data for all</p> <p>9 women?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. To Woolen?</p> <p>13 A. They -- they say data -- the data from</p> <p>14 NHSI were provided and described in Supplemental</p> <p>15 Table 1. But it is not entirely clear to me did</p> <p>16 they provide it for all women in the study or only</p> <p>17 those -- I don't know -- they don't specify.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you look at Supplemental Table 1?</p> <p>19 A. I -- I don't have it here. Do you --</p> <p>20 Q. Do you recall if you looked at it in</p> <p>21 evaluating the paper?</p> <p>22 A. I know that I looked at the</p> <p>23 supplemental data just trying --</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: I'm going to get it to</p> <p>25 you, yep.</p>
<p>Page 151</p> <p>1 that also not an apples-to-apples comparison?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>3 Misstates the evidence.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: You know, again, I do</p> <p>5 not recall the -- the scores right off that</p> <p>6 he gave on this scale. I already stated</p> <p>7 that I didn't do a comparison. And I've</p> <p>8 explained that there is some subjectivity</p> <p>9 in assigning the scores, and I don't know</p> <p>10 what their thought processes were.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Did the authors of Woolen use all</p> <p>13 women from the NHSI study with frequent use in</p> <p>14 their meta-analysis?</p> <p>15 A. Okay. They indicate that they</p> <p>16 included women with intact fallopian tubes.</p> <p>17 Q. Where are you reading from?</p> <p>18 A. It is in the footnote to Table 2.</p> <p>19 Q. Uh-huh. Footnote 5?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And why do they say they did that?</p> <p>22 A. They said to harmonize with other</p> <p>23 publications.</p> <p>24 Q. Are there any other publications</p> <p>25 listed in Table 2 that are limited to patent</p>	<p>Page 153</p> <p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: We're going to mark it</p> <p>2 as an exhibit.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Mine is marked up. I</p> <p>5 don't think you're going to approve of</p> <p>6 that. Mine has marks on it, so let's get a</p> <p>7 clean one.</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: Exhibit 11. I'm sorry?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: I said, mine has marks</p> <p>10 on it, so let's get a clean one.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah, let's not use</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: I'm sure you won't like</p> <p>14 mine.</p> <p>15 MS. DAVIDSON: We're going to mark as</p> <p>16 Exhibit 11 Supplementary Table 1.</p> <p>17 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 11, Supplementary</p> <p>18 Table 1, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Okay. In</p> <p>20 Supplemental -- Supplementary Table 1 --</p> <p>21 let's see. Yeah, they -- they report that</p> <p>22 they got data from all women. And then</p> <p>23 they separate out the data for the women</p> <p>24 with patent, have fallopian tubes.</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 Q. Would there have been more ovarian 2 cancer cases if Woolen had done its analysis with 3 all women?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, there would have been.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you done any analysis as to how 6 that might change the -- might have changed the 7 reported OR for this paper?</p> <p>8 A. I have not done any analysis in that 9 regard, no.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know if it would have been 11 lower?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: The adjusted hazard 14 ratio for all women was 1.27. Again, 15 statistically significantly increase, but 16 it was lower than what they observed for 17 the women -- or what they reported for the 18 women with the patent fallopian tubes, 19 which was 1.40.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. That was for daily users?</p> <p>22 A. Right.</p> <p>23 Q. And what are the criteria for this 24 paper?</p> <p>25 A. Okay. The criteria for including a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 to say but what they actually analyzed were 2 the most frequent -- the highest level of 3 exposure reported in the study. And it 4 just would be, in this case, among those 5 studies that met their criteria of 6 reporting on use at least 2 times a week, 7 all of the studies had 4 times a week or 8 more than --</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Would it have been more accurate to 11 state in the background that they actually did a 12 meta-analysis of data for 4 times or more per week 13 use?</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: So, once again, it's 16 like they set out these criteria. "A study 17 would be included if," and so if they 18 reported use on at least 2 times a week. 19 So that was -- this is the cut point they 20 used for including the study or not.</p> <p>21 Then they went through looking at all 22 the studies. And it's like these 11 23 studies met that criteria of having at 24 least 2 times a week, but they actually had 25 greater than 2 times a week.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 study was that it had to be 2 or more times per 2 week. And then in Table 2 of the main paper, they 3 specify the talc exposure that they apparently 4 considered frequent use, and it was daily in the 5 O'Brien study.</p> <p>6 Q. While we're looking at Table 2, under 7 specification of talc exposure, are any of those 8 frequencies listed there less than 4 times a week?</p> <p>9 A. No. The -- Mills reports their 10 highest category of exposure was 4 to 7 times per 11 week. And I believe that's what they did, that 12 they -- I believe that they were looking at the 13 women in the highest category of use.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know why it says on Page 1 that 15 they looked at 2 times per week or more use, when 16 Table 2 shows that, actually, they only used data 17 for 4 times or more per week use?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Once again, it was -- 20 they established that criteria that a study 21 had to -- apparently, that's the criteria 22 they established; that to be included in 23 their analysis, they had to have this 24 exposure of at least 2 times a week.</p> <p>25 And then I believe they went on to --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 So it's kind of like the distinction 2 between what is the minimum level to be 3 included as one of the studies versus what 4 was actually done in that study.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know how many of the papers 7 listed here as 1 through 11 provide hazard ratios 8 for 2 or more times per week of use?</p> <p>9 A. No, I have not gone through them 10 individually to look at that.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know whether the risk ratios 12 reported in these papers for 2 times per week or 13 more of use differ from those set forth in Table 14 2?</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Please repeat that 17 question. I didn't catch it.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you repeat it? 19 (The following question was read back: 20 Q: Do you know whether the risk 21 ratios reported in these papers for 2 times 22 per week or more of use differ from those 23 set forth in Table 2?)</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: As I said, I don't 25 recall specifically from these studies</p>

<p>1 which, if any, reported an odds ratio for 2 specifically 2 times a week or more. I 3 don't know what the categories were -- 4 which were -- off the top of my head, I 5 don't know the categories of frequency of 6 use that each of these studies reported on.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. So you don't know how using data for 2 9 times more per week of use would have changed the 10 results of this paper?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 12 her testimony.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I just want to make sure 14 that my recollection is correct, that 15 they --</p> <p>16 Okay. As they describe in the title 17 to Table 2, they -- it's the most frequent 18 perineal talcum powder use reported for 19 each study was abstracted.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. Correct. And my question was --</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Wait. I think she was 23 in the midst of answering the question.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: And --</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: Give her a moment.</p>	<p>Page 158</p> <p>1 that analysis. So I can't say that I know 2 what it would be.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. You didn't go back to the papers and 5 do your own analysis?</p> <p>6 A. No, I did not.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Would you mind if -- I 8 mean, I don't know if you're mostly 9 finished with this paper or not, but we've 10 been going for quite a while. Would you 11 mind taking a break?</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: Do you want to take a 13 break? What time is it?</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: It's 2:00.</p> <p>15 MR. TRANGLE: It's 2:00.</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: The thing is, at 2:30 I 17 need to take a break. So you want --</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I understand.</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: -- to take one now and 20 then again?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Take a short one. Yeah, 22 let's take a short one.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Just to get up and 24 stretch.</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: We'll come back in five</p>
<p>Page 159</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: -- again, this is the 2 decision they made about how they wanted to 3 analyze the data, because my understanding 4 is they thought that it would be useful 5 what to look at, what is the risk among 6 women who use it most frequently.</p> <p>7 And it was, you know, the purpose of 8 their paper to look at the -- the 9 highest-frequency users. And so I don't 10 know if they would have had the data to 11 look specifically at greater than 2 times 12 per week. I expect that the 13 categorizations in many of the studies 14 were -- would not have lent itself to that.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. My question simply is: Do you know 17 whether the reported hazard ratio would have 18 changed in this meta-analysis if they had used the 19 data from these papers that involved 2 times per 20 more of use as opposed to using the most frequent 21 perineal talcum powder use reported for each 22 study?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 24 answered.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: They did not present</p>	<p>Page 161</p> <p>1 minutes.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Absolutely.</p> <p>3 * * *</p> <p>4 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the 5 proceedings from 2:01 p.m. to 2:07 p.m.)</p> <p>6 * * *</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. Dr. Moorman, at the front of the 9 Woolen paper on the author's list of 10 inclusion/exclusion criteria, do they say that 11 they are going to include only studies involving 12 women with patent tubes?</p> <p>13 A. They did not specify that, that I see.</p> <p>14 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Let's mark as 15 Exhibit 12 -- let's mark as Exhibit 12 Wu 16 2009.</p> <p>17 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 12, Markers of 18 inflammation and risk of ovarian cancer in 19 Los Angeles County, was marked for 20 identification.)</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Are you familiar with that paper?</p> <p>23 A. I'm sorry. Wu --</p> <p>24 Q. Wu 2009.</p> <p>25 MR. TRANGLE: Wu 2009.</p>

<p>1 THE WITNESS: Wu. Wu.</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: It's W-U.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. We're getting it for you.</p> <p>5 A. Okay. All right.</p> <p>6 Q. This is going to be Exhibit 12 as soon</p> <p>7 as we put a sticker on it.</p> <p>8 A. Okay.</p> <p>9 Q. Anna Wu, et al., "Markers of</p> <p>10 inflammation and risk of ovarian cancer in</p> <p>11 Los Angeles County."</p> <p>12 A. Yeah.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay.</p> <p>14 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>15 Q. This -- this paper is on your reliance</p> <p>16 list, right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. If we go down to Table 2, there's a</p> <p>19 section entitled "Frequency and duration of talc</p> <p>20 use," correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And for greater than 10 times per</p> <p>23 month but less than 30 times per month; do you see</p> <p>24 that?</p> <p>25 A. So --</p>	<p>Page 162</p> <p>1 30 times per month. Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A. I --</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: So that's the second</p> <p>4 column.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: The second --</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Row.</p> <p>8 A. -- second row under --</p> <p>9 Q. Not column.</p> <p>10 A. -- that category. Okay.</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: I'm getting you back</p> <p>12 because you made fun of my eyes.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. So what is the risk ratio</p> <p>15 there?</p> <p>16 A. It is 1.16.</p> <p>17 Q. Is it statistically significant?</p> <p>18 A. The confidence interval goes from .63</p> <p>19 to 2.12, so it is not statistically significant.</p> <p>20 Q. Is 10 times per month at least 2 times</p> <p>21 per week?</p> <p>22 A. At least -- is 10 times per month at</p> <p>23 least 2 times per week? Yes. You could -- you</p> <p>24 could quibble someone used it in a different</p> <p>25 manner. But, yeah, we'll -- we'll go with that.</p>
<p>1 MS. PARFITT: It starts with the</p> <p>2 years.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Okay. So --</p> <p>4 MR. TRANGLE: The years.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. So let's look at -- let's look at 10</p> <p>8 to 20 years of use.</p> <p>9 A. I'm sorry. I'm not seeing 20 to --</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: And I'm not seeing it</p> <p>11 on --</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: -- 10 to 20 years of</p> <p>13 use.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. This is really hard on my eyes, but I</p> <p>16 thought it says less than 20 years and greater</p> <p>17 than 10 years. Am I reading that wrong?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: No, no. Less than 20</p> <p>19 years and less than or equal to 10 times</p> <p>20 per month.</p> <p>21 (Off-the-record conference.)</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. So apologies for my bad eyesight, but</p> <p>24 what I'm trying to look at is for less than or</p> <p>25 equal to 20 years and greater than 10 to less than</p>	<p>Page 163</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Yes. And it met the</p> <p>3 metric for including the study in -- in</p> <p>4 there, in the analysis.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. And if you look at less than 20 years</p> <p>7 and greater than 30 times per month, we can all</p> <p>8 agree that -- I hope -- that greater than 30 times</p> <p>9 per month is more than 2 times a week?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And what's the risk ratio of that?</p> <p>12 A. 1.23.</p> <p>13 Q. And is that statistically significant?</p> <p>14 A. The confidence interval is 0.63 to</p> <p>15 2.41. So it is not statistically significant.</p> <p>16 Q. And Woolen chose not to use that</p> <p>17 either, right?</p> <p>18 A. As Woolen described in their paper,</p> <p>19 they opted to go with the most frequent powder use</p> <p>20 reported.</p> <p>21 Q. I understand.</p> <p>22 A. So they did not --</p>

<p>1 MS. PARFITT: Let her finish.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: They did not</p> <p>3 specifically use that. They went with the</p> <p>4 criteria that they laid out in their paper</p> <p>5 for the analysis they performed.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. And if you look at frequency and</p> <p>8 duration of talc use, in fact, the -- the data</p> <p>9 that they use for their meta-analysis is actually</p> <p>10 the only statistically significant increased risk</p> <p>11 reported in this table, correct?</p> <p>12 A. In this table, they report a number</p> <p>13 of --</p> <p>14 Q. I'm talking about for frequency and</p> <p>15 duration of talc use.</p> <p>16 A. Okay. Just that one section of the</p> <p>17 table. That is the only one that is statistically</p> <p>18 significant. And, of course, as you well know,</p> <p>19 statistical significance is driven in part by</p> <p>20 sample size. And when you look at these</p> <p>21 categories, the numbers within the individual</p> <p>22 categories are -- are pretty small. So it's not</p> <p>23 too surprising that some of these are not</p> <p>24 statistically significant.</p> <p>25 Q. I have a question. Has anyone done a</p>	<p>Page 166</p> <p>1 Woolen, and you couldn't recall any such papers.</p> <p>2 Do you remember that conversation?</p> <p>3 A. Frequent?</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 A. Yeah, I recall that conversation.</p> <p>6 Q. And had you forgotten that the Davis</p> <p>7 paper actually has a definition for "frequent</p> <p>8 genital powder use"?</p> <p>9 A. Are you getting -- I know that we had</p> <p>10 frequency of use and we had some categories.</p> <p>11 Q. If you look at Table 1, doesn't the</p> <p>12 Davis paper define "frequent genital powder use"</p> <p>13 as greater than monthly?</p> <p>14 A. Yeah. I mean, that was the definition</p> <p>15 guided by the availability of the data.</p> <p>16 Q. You hadn't recalled that when we</p> <p>17 discussed papers defining --</p> <p>18 A. I didn't recall -- I recall that we</p> <p>19 used those categorizations of frequency. I didn't</p> <p>20 recall the actual frequent genital powder use, the</p> <p>21 heading that was used here. I was well aware that</p> <p>22 we had categorized it by less than once a week or</p> <p>23 greater than once a week.</p> <p>24 Q. So you and your co-authors defined</p> <p>25 "frequent genital powder use" differently from</p>
<p>1 study as to whether recall bias affects</p> <p>2 recollections of frequency of use?</p> <p>3 A. I am not aware of such a study, and</p> <p>4 without having kind of a gold standard of how much</p> <p>5 was really used and how frequently, I don't know</p> <p>6 how such a study could actually be done.</p> <p>7 Q. In Schildkraut, you looked at recall</p> <p>8 bias based on ever use and never use, right?</p> <p>9 A. We did that in relation to a</p> <p>10 certain -- a certain time point, yeah, a certain</p> <p>11 time frame.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you also look at reports of</p> <p>13 frequency?</p> <p>14 A. I don't recall if we did that or not.</p> <p>15 Q. I'd like to go back to the Davis</p> <p>16 paper.</p> <p>17 MR. TRANGLE: Exhibit 7.</p> <p>18 MS. DAVIDSON: Huh?</p> <p>19 MR. TRANGLE: Exhibit 7.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. I have to find it first before we can</p> <p>22 go back to it. Do you have that in front of you?</p> <p>23 We talked a little bit earlier about</p> <p>24 whether any papers have defined "frequent genital</p> <p>25 powder use" differently from -- differently from</p>	<p>Page 167</p> <p>1 Woolen, correct?</p> <p>2 A. The definition that we used was based</p> <p>3 on the availability of the data from the</p> <p>4 individual studies. As you're aware of, this was</p> <p>5 a consortium that used data from five different</p> <p>6 studies. And we had to harmonize the data,</p> <p>7 because some of the studies collected the data</p> <p>8 in -- in different manners, different</p> <p>9 categorizations and so on.</p> <p>10 And so that was the decision that was</p> <p>11 driven by the -- how the data were put together in</p> <p>12 the individual studies and how we could harmonize</p> <p>13 it to do the analysis.</p> <p>14 Q. Is it your testimony that you picked</p> <p>15 once per week and not twice per week because these</p> <p>16 studies would not have allowed you to do a</p> <p>17 twice-per-week analysis?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah. They -- each of the studies</p> <p>19 used slightly different phrasing in terms of</p> <p>20 relation to frequency. And so I don't recall all</p> <p>21 of the, you know, specific details as to how we</p> <p>22 settled on that cut point. But I know that it was</p> <p>23 based -- you know, as it typically is when you're</p> <p>24 trying to harmonize data from different studies,</p> <p>25 how you can combine the data from the various</p>
	<p>Page 169</p>

<p>1 studies.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you testifying here today that the 3 exposure assessments in the underlying studies for 4 the Davis paper would not have enabled you to 5 choose 2 times per week?</p> <p>6 A. I'm really not -- not sure. Some of 7 them, it looks like the number of days per week. 8 Some -- some it was reported a bit differently. 9 And like I said, I'm just -- I don't recall the 10 particular discussion that led to that.</p> <p>11 Q. So sitting here today, you don't know 12 why Davis defines "frequent use" differently from 13 Woolen, correct?</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates 15 her testimony.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Just -- give me just a 17 moment. I just don't recall that 18 discussion as to why that -- that 19 particular cut point was used.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. Do you recall if you were part of the 22 decision to define "frequent genital powder use" 23 as more than once per week?</p> <p>24 A. I -- the way that these -- these 25 papers worked, the lead authors, they typically</p>	<p>Page 170</p> <p>1 here.</p> <p>2 Q. And you've agreed that none of the 3 authors of this paper, O'Brien, Ogunsina, 4 Wentzensen or Sandler, are experts in this 5 litigation?</p> <p>6 A. To my knowledge, none of them are.</p> <p>7 Q. And, in fact, O'Brien and 8 Wentzensen -- right? -- they work for NIH, right?</p> <p>9 A. Correct. Well, I know --</p> <p>10 Q. Unclear if you can even -- if they 11 would even be allowed to be experts in litigation. 12 I don't know the answer to that question, do you?</p> <p>13 A. I think that -- I think that I have 14 heard that government employees cannot be, but --</p> <p>15 Q. Got it.</p> <p>16 A. -- I don't know.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. I have heard that, but I don't know 19 that that's to be -- that's true or not.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Do you have a copy of this that 21 Asher gave you?</p> <p>22 A. I do.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Great.</p> <p>24 You had said something earlier today 25 that there was language in O'Brien 2023 about</p>
<p>Page 171</p> <p>1 would do the work. They would share it with the 2 other authors -- the lead authors would take the 3 lead on the analysis. They would share it with 4 the co-authors during our monthly or biweekly 5 meetings, and so not every decision was discussed 6 in great detail.</p> <p>7 I -- I just don't remember 8 specifically. This is one of many papers from 9 this consortium, and I don't recall the particular 10 discussion.</p> <p>11 (Off-the-record conference.)</p> <p>12 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Let's look at O'Brien 2023 --</p> <p>14 A. Okay.</p> <p>15 Q. -- which we will mark -- here, we'll 16 mark it as Exhibit 13.</p> <p>17 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 13, Douching and 18 Genital Talc Use: Patterns of Use and 19 Reliability of Self-reported Exposure, was 20 marked for identification.)</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Exhibit 13 is "Douching and Genital 23 Talc Use: Patterns of Use and Reliability of 24 Self-reported Exposure," O'Brien, 2023.</p> <p>25 A. Yes. I have a detached version in</p>	<p>Page 171</p> <p>1 average age when women start using talc powder 2 products, so you wanted to see the paper.</p> <p>3 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>4 Q. So here it is. Do you want to just go 5 back and let me know what O'Brien 2023 says about 6 the average age of initiation of talc use.</p> <p>7 A. Okay. I am looking at Table 2, and 8 they reported the age at first use, the mean in 9 standard deviation across a number of categories, 10 race ethnicity and by educational level. And for 11 the women -- the total group of women, the average 12 age of first use is 21 years.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And let's introduce as 14 Exhibit 14 a paper by Dr. Cramer, which I believe 15 you've also relied on in the past, "The 16 Association Between Talc Use and Ovarian Cancer: 17 A Retrospective Case-Control Study in Two US 18 States. Lead author, Daniel Cramer, May 2016. 19 That's Exhibit 14.</p> <p>20 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 14, The Association 21 Between Talc Use and Ovarian Cancer: A 22 Retrospective Case-Control Study in Two US 23 States, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall whether Dr. Cramer's</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 paper -- do you recall whether Dr. Cramer's paper 2 addresses first age of use of ovarian cancer 3 [sic]?</p> <p>4 A. I didn't recall the specific details 5 of this particular paper, but I do see here in 6 Table 1 that they report age at first use of 7 genital powder.</p> <p>8 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>9 A. And -- okay. And among the women who 10 had used it -- let's see. So those percentages 11 don't lend itself to how I'd like to do this.</p> <p>12 So there are roughly 550 control 13 subjects who reported use of talc, and 343 of them 14 reported that they were younger than 20 at first 15 use. And the proportions are not very different 16 among the case subjects -- yeah. Did you follow 17 what I said?</p> <p>18 Q. Yes. But my math isn't as good as 19 yours, and I would call something more 20 straightforward in here that provides that 21 information.</p> <p>22 In any event, does this paper more or 23 less comport with O'Brien in terms of when women 24 start using talcum powder?</p> <p>25 A. Yeah. It's not too far off. They</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: No, I am not. I was 2 anxiously --</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: I was in the middle of 4 a question. That's --</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: -- holding onto each one 6 of your questions.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: I see.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. You had testified earlier that tubal 10 ligation typically would take place in women 30s 11 or 40s, correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. I think that the -- I believe 13 that I have read data that indicates it around 14 30 -- in the 30s sometime is the typical age of 15 tubal ligation. Average age, you know.</p> <p>16 Q. So the average age for the beginning 17 of talc use is long before the average age for 18 tubal ligation or other surgeries that would 19 result in a woman not having patent tubes, 20 correct?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Okay. That the average 23 age of the tubal ligation is -- is ten 24 years or so than the average age of 25 initiation of talc use from these studies.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 report it a little bit differently, and it's 2 like -- a mean age in the O'Brien study was around 3 21. And they report it in categories here but -- 4 of women who have used talc, the majority of them 5 certainly start using it before age 20. So they 6 seem to be in the same ballpark.</p> <p>7 Q. And we can all agree that that's a 8 good decade before?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Before what?</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. At least a decade --</p> <p>12 A. I'm -- I'm not --</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: You said "before."</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: -- following your 15 question.</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: I didn't follow you.</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: You said, "Before 18 what?" I wasn't done with my question.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Oh, oh, oh, oh, I'm 20 sorry.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I'm so sorry.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Okay. I thought you 23 were, like, done. Okay.</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: You were just, like, 25 ready to pounce on me.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. More than ten years because 31 is your 3 early 30s, right?</p> <p>4 A. You know, you're asking me to recall 5 things -- some data that I'm not sure when I would 6 have read it. So I can't say exactly.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I need to take a 8 break.</p> <p>9 * * *</p> <p>10 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the 11 proceedings from 2:31 p.m. to 3:16 p.m.)</p> <p>12 * * *</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: Apologizing for those 14 on Zoom as well for the break, and I 15 appreciate your courtesy.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. When we went off the record, I think 18 we were talking about O'Brien 2023. And O'Brien 19 2023 looks into the reliability of self-reported 20 exposure, correct?</p> <p>21 A. Among other things, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And the author states in the 23 introduction that if historic use cannot be 24 accurately recalled, measurement error can bias 25 effect estimates, especially if recall reliability</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 differs by outcome status. Do you agree with 2 that?</p> <p>3 A. That is his theoretic concern, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. When you say it's a theoretic concern, 5 what do you mean by "theoretic"?</p> <p>6 A. It doesn't necessarily mean that it is 7 biased, but it is a potential bias.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, if people can't remember how 9 frequently they used a product, and if the recall 10 reliability differs by outcome status, then you're 11 going to have a bias problem, right?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: That's what I'm saying, 14 that it is a theoretical concern. And 15 we're not disagreeing here. I'm saying, 16 yes, I agree that it is a potential 17 concern.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. And did O'Brien look at the question 20 of accuracy in reports of frequency of use?</p> <p>21 A. I don't recall them reporting that.</p> <p>22 I -- I see in -- I can -- I see in the table that 23 they're comparing ever use of the talc at the 24 different time points, but --</p> <p>25 Q. I did not find in O'Brien 2023 any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 use in the 12 months prior to enrollment was 14 2 percent.</p> <p>3 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>4 A. And they're supposed to be comparing 5 what was reported at enrollment to what was 6 reported for that same time period in the 7 follow-up.</p> <p>8 And so it can't be 27 percent, because 9 it was 14 percent at the original baseline. If we 10 can look at the Supplemental Table 6, I can point 11 out what I think is the error.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you consider that the possibility 13 was that 14 percent was 12 months prior and 27 14 percent was the women who were 12 months prior and 15 who reported use in adolescence?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: But that's not what 18 they're reporting on. Okay. Let's --</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>21 A. Okay.</p> <p>22 Q. If you look at Table 3 --</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Wait. She's in the 24 middle of something, Jessica. Hold on.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Just -- and it is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 discussion about any analysis of whether frequency 2 of use had been reported accurately, did you?</p> <p>3 A. I don't recall seeing that. I don't 4 know if there's any sentence in there or not 5 that -- that addresses it. I just don't recall 6 that.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And O'Brien found that women 8 who -- among women with intervening ovarian cancer 9 diagnoses, 28 percent had originally reported talc 10 powder use, but that figure increased to 11 33 percent at follow-up, correct?</p> <p>12 A. No, I do not think that is correct at 13 all. Okay.</p> <p>14 Q. That's what O'Brien stated, right?</p> <p>15 A. They stated it, and as I stated in my 16 report, using the data that they have here, it is 17 an obvious error.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And why don't you tell me what 19 you think that error is.</p> <p>20 A. Okay. So they were comparing ever use 21 of genital talc, how it was reported at two time 22 points.</p> <p>23 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>24 A. And it was based on ever use, 12 25 months before enrollment. And so in Table 3, ever</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 really very critical to look at --</p> <p>2 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>3 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>4 A. -- the table -- supplemental -- I 5 think it's Supplemental Table 6. Okay. So what 6 they state --</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: We can mark 8 Supplemental Table 6 as an exhibit as well. 9 I was going to be marking it later, but...</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Okay. But anyhow...</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>13 A. Okay. What they are stating on 14 Page 383 -- it's the paragraph above the 15 discussion --</p> <p>16 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 A. -- it said -- and the reliability 18 measures for genital talc use were similar for 19 ovarian cancer compared to the full sample. 20 However, while self-reported use in the 12 months 21 before enrollment, it was more commonly reported 22 on the enrollment questionnaire relative to the 23 fourth detailed questionnaire. And then they go 24 on to say that --</p> <p>25 Q. Uh-huh.</p>

<p>1 A. -- that was --</p> <p>2 Q. Right.</p> <p>3 A. They go on. But self-reported use of</p> <p>4 talc in the 12 months before enrollment was not 27</p> <p>5 percent, according to what they reported. It</p> <p>6 was --</p> <p>7 Q. Correct.</p> <p>8 A. -- 14 percent.</p> <p>9 Q. Right. So that was just a</p> <p>10 typographical error here --</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. -- and they meant -- because 27</p> <p>13 percent and 21 percent do correlate to 12 months</p> <p>14 prior and use in adolescence, correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's not what they're -- they're</p> <p>16 saying --</p> <p>17 Q. But --</p> <p>18 A. -- there. They --</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Let her finish, please.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. And, again --</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Let her finish, Jessica.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: -- I think that if we</p> <p>24 look at the supplemental table --</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>	<p>Page 182</p> <p>1 enrollment."</p> <p>2 Q. But the typo is the heading, not the</p> <p>3 percentage, right?</p> <p>4 A. The typo is here. These are switched.</p> <p>5 The percent use of talc in the 12 months prior to</p> <p>6 enrollment was 14 percent.</p> <p>7 And then the percent douching -- let's</p> <p>8 see. Okay. It's -- I'm just trying -- what they</p> <p>9 are saying here certainly makes -- is more</p> <p>10 consistent with what is reported in the rest of</p> <p>11 the paper with the exception of that paragraph.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: And for the record, your</p> <p>13 "here" is Supplemental Table 6?</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Thank you.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Can I ask you a question? If you look</p> <p>18 at Table 2 --</p> <p>19 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>20 Q. -- on ever use of talc --</p> <p>21 A. Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q. -- what's the percentage reported</p> <p>23 there? Table 2, O'Brien 2023 --</p> <p>24 A. Yeah.</p> <p>25 Q. -- ever use of talc, what's the</p>
<p>1 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>2 A. -- it becomes much more clear. And I</p> <p>3 believe the typo and then the description of the</p> <p>4 typo arises from this table. So when you look up</p> <p>5 here, under douching, it said: Percent use in 12</p> <p>6 months prior to enrollment --</p> <p>7 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>8 A. -- 14 percent.</p> <p>9 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>10 A. That's not what was reported for</p> <p>11 douching. 27 percent was the prevalence of</p> <p>12 douching in the 12 months prior to enrollment.</p> <p>13 What I believe happened is that they</p> <p>14 just switched the headings because this is</p> <p>15 consistent with the data that's reported in the</p> <p>16 body of the paper. This, I think, they just made</p> <p>17 a rather significant mistake.</p> <p>18 Q. If you look at the top -- right?</p> <p>19 A. Yeah.</p> <p>20 Q. -- eTable 6, it says: self-report</p> <p>21 ever use of douche or genital talc. Correct?</p> <p>22 A. I'm looking at what's the heading</p> <p>23 directly above -- above this here.</p> <p>24 Q. Right.</p> <p>25 A. "% used in 12 months prior to</p>	<p>Page 183</p> <p>1 percentage reported?</p> <p>2 A. It's 27 percent, but what they are --</p> <p>3 Q. That's the same 27 --</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Wait.</p> <p>5 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>6 Q. And that's the same number as there is</p> <p>7 in Supplemental eTable 6, right?</p> <p>8 A. But what -- that's not what they're</p> <p>9 describing. They're describing the comparison of</p> <p>10 the 12 months prior to enrollment --</p> <p>11 Q. Correct.</p> <p>12 A. -- in their --</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Please let her finish.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: -- in their -- yeah, in</p> <p>15 the discussion, they are saying</p> <p>16 self-reported use in the 12 months -- 12</p> <p>17 months before enrollment. And that was --</p> <p>18 that's not what they present in other parts</p> <p>19 of their paper and --</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. But my question is: If you look at</p> <p>22 eTable 6 and it says ever use of talc, that 27</p> <p>23 percent would be accurate but for that heading on</p> <p>24 top of it, if -- if --</p> <p>25 A. I mean --</p>

<p>1 Q. 27 percent is the correct figure for 2 ever use of talc, correct? 3 A. Well, again, what's labeled here is 4 not -- 5 MS. PARFITT: And if you can identify 6 "here" -- I'm sorry -- 7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 8 MS. PARFITT: -- so we can have it 9 correct. 10 THE WITNESS: What's labeled -- where 11 it says "Genital Talc Use," I'm just 12 looking at percent used in 12 months prior 13 to enrollment and then the follow-up, and 14 that 12 months prior to enrollment and 15 follow-up is what they're describing in the 16 text, and it just doesn't match up. 17 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 18 Q. But -- but I'm asking you a different 19 question, and my question is: It does match up, 20 that 27 percent, to the heading for eTable 6, 21 correct? 22 A. Again, but, you know, there -- there's 23 an error here. And so when there's an obvious 24 error, I mean, it matches up, the 20 percent ever, 25 but it's not what they're describing in the paper.</p>	<p>Page 186</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. There's a typo. 3 A. Well, I mean, it's -- what they're 4 describing in the text is not matching up with the 5 table, and so it raises concerns. 6 Q. But wait a minute. The 14 percent and 7 27 percent in eTable 6 match up perfectly with 8 ever use in the article; is that correct? Can we 9 agree on that? 10 A. It matches up with ever -- their ever 11 use, but that's not what the authors are 12 describing here. 13 Q. But -- but the heading of the table 14 says "ever use," correct? 15 A. We -- there are inconsistencies; we 16 can agree on all of that. And when there are 17 inconsistencies, we -- 18 Q. That's not what I'm asking you. I'm 19 asking you: Does the heading of this table say 20 "ever use," eTable 6? 21 A. It -- it does. 22 Q. Okay. And are 14 percent and 23 27 percent accurate for ever use? That's all I'm 24 asking. 25 A. Yes.</p>
<p>1 And so we know that there's an error. 2 We don't know exactly what it is. But -- but it 3 certainly reduces the confidence in what they're 4 reporting in their paper. 5 Q. So 14 percent is the correct number 6 for ever use of douching, right? 7 A. I -- that's what they report in 8 Table 1. 9 Q. So really what's going on is that 10 eTable 6 is reporting ever use instead of last 11 12-month use, correct? 12 A. We don't know. 13 Q. What do you mean "We don't know"? The 14 numbers match. 15 A. Well, we know that there's an error 16 and -- 17 Q. There's a typo, right? 18 MS. PARFITT: Wait. Jessica, we -- 19 honestly, I -- 20 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 21 MS. PARFITT: Just one person at a -- 22 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 23 Q. Okay. 24 MS. PARFITT: -- time will be helpful. 25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, we know that --</p>	<p>Page 187</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. We can move on. 2 THE REPORTER: Did we want that 3 marked? 4 MR. TRANGLE: Yeah. 5 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. We can mark 6 eTable 6. I'm sorry. 7 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 15, Supplemental 8 eTable 6, was marked for identification.) 9 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. We're marking as 10 Exhibit 15, after we discussed it, 11 Supplemental Table 6 from O'Brien 2023 as 12 Exhibit 15. 13 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 14 Q. Since you were concerned about the 15 headings on eTable 6, did you send a letter to 16 Dr. O'Brien asking her about it? 17 A. I have thought about it, but I have 18 not done it. 19 Q. Got it. 20 Okay. When Gonzalez reported on the 21 sister study, it used the 14 percent number that 22 was just use in the prior 12 months, correct? 23 A. That is correct. 24 Q. And when -- 25 A. 12 months prior to enrollment, yes.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 Q. And when O'Brien looked at the sister 2 study, it used the higher 27 percent ever use 3 number from the sister study, right?</p> <p>4 A. Let me just double-check that. I 5 believe that is correct. Yes, that is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. So O'Brien addressed one of your 7 criticisms of Gonzalez, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes. To some degree, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Well, that -- that criticism of 10 Gonzalez was addressed?</p> <p>11 A. I said, to some degree --</p> <p>12 Q. Why only to some degree?</p> <p>13 A. Because they addressed use from -- I 14 think it was age 10 to 13 and use from one year 15 prior to enrollment. So any use between age 13 16 and their age at enrollment was not captured.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know, on average, for women who 18 have used talcum powder in their genital area how 19 many years they usually use it?</p> <p>20 A. O'Brien did report some of that. I'm 21 sorry. I'm -- and I thought that it was in here, 22 but I don't see where they reported how long they 23 had used it on average.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you recall any papers by Cramer or 25 otherwise that address the typical length of time</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 her testimony.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: What I said in my 3 report, the -- I think it was in relation 4 to the O'Brien study -- I said that it did 5 somewhat address it. But as I just stated 6 a few minutes ago, any use between age 13 7 and a year before enrollment into the 8 cohort would not have been captured. And, 9 you know, we -- so it helped, but it didn't 10 completely address it.</p> <p>11 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>12 Q. How come in your report when you said 13 that O'Brien 2023 cast serious doubts on Gonzalez, 14 you didn't mention that O'Brien 2020 helps to 15 address that?</p> <p>16 A. I -- I think that I made -- I know 17 that I made a true statement there. What we 18 learned from Gonzalez -- or from the O'Brien in 19 relation to the Gonzalez is that the exposure 20 measurement used in Gonzalez misclassified over 21 half of the talc users.</p> <p>22 So there were around 30 percent ever 23 talc users, and they said 14 percent. That was 24 the prevalence of use in the Gonzalez study. So 25 it was, like, even worse than a coin flip in terms</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 women who have used perineal talc use it for?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Many papers have 4 reported on the duration of talc use. And 5 many of them reported in categories rather 6 than a mean duration of use. And I'm -- 7 again, you know, all of the little details, 8 it's hard to remember across all of the 9 studies.</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know if the typical woman who 12 uses talc uses it for more or less than ten years?</p> <p>13 A. I mean, there's a wide variation in 14 patterns of talc use. There are certainly many, 15 many long-term users and some that -- you know, as 16 we have seen in our studies, some that report 17 short-term use.</p> <p>18 Q. On average, do women who use talc use 19 it for more or less than ten years?</p> <p>20 A. I -- I can't give an average. I'm 21 sorry.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So in your report, when you say 23 that O'Brien 2023 casts serious doubt on Gonzalez, 24 that's actually addressed by O'Brien 2020, right?</p> <p>25 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 of classifying talc exposure among the women who 2 had used it.</p> <p>3 And the reason why I think that it's 4 important is that many of the meta-analyses report 5 the Gonzalez relative risk -- that was -- like, 6 the .73, that was what they reported. And it's 7 always been an outlier. It's one of the most 8 extreme values reported. And this -- given the 9 information we have about the level of exposure 10 misclassification, it does cast doubt on the 11 Gonzalez study.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you remember my question?</p> <p>13 A. Well, I asked -- you know, I -- I'm 14 explaining why I thought it was important to 15 mention that, and I think that the statement is 16 true.</p> <p>17 I did also put in my report, when 18 describing the O'Brien study, that -- the O'Brien 19 study combining the four cohorts, that they did do 20 a better job, but there was still limitations.</p> <p>21 Q. But when you say there's serious doubt 22 in the Gonzalez study, you don't mention that 23 O'Brien nearly doubled the prevalence of talc use 24 and still found no significantly -- statistically 25 significant association, correct?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 2 answered.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Please, would you repeat 4 the question?</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Would you repeat it? I 6 can't remember it.</p> <p>7 (The following question was read back: 8 Q: But when you say there's serious 9 doubt in the Gonzalez study, you don't 10 mention that O'Brien nearly doubled the 11 prevalence of talc use and still found no 12 significantly -- statistically significant 13 association, correct?)</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: We have already 15 discussed what was found. It was a 16 considerable change in the odds ratio, and 17 it went from .73 to just slightly above 1 18 in the sister study.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. But not statistically significant, 21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. It was not statistically significant, 23 no.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Great. Let's move on. 25 Have you ever cited in a published</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Did Health Canada, to your 2 recollection -- and if you don't recall, that's 3 fine. But do you recall if they did an assessment 4 of subtypes of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>5 A. Again, I -- off the top of my head, 6 I -- I -- you know, I want to be correct. And off 7 the top of my head, I -- I can't remember. There 8 are a lot of papers we have been talking about and 9 I have read recently, so...</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Do you think there's sufficient 11 data to assess any potential association or causal 12 relationship between cosmetic talc and each 13 individual subtype of epithelial ovarian cancer?</p> <p>14 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 15 answered quite a few hours ago.</p> <p>16 MS. DAVIDSON: I didn't ask it.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: That's -- that's exactly 18 what I was going to --</p> <p>19 MS. DAVIDSON: Well, then let's repeat 20 the question because I didn't ask the 21 question, so maybe you didn't hear it 22 right. Can you repeat the question?</p> <p>23 (The following question was read back: 24 Q: Do you think there's sufficient 25 data to assess any potential association or</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p> <p>1 paper a -- the regulatory findings of an 2 organization as support for your epidemiological 3 opinions?</p> <p>4 A. I'm just trying to think. I cannot 5 come up with an example off the top of my head. 6 It's very likely, very possible that I did, but I 7 can't come up with a specific example.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you think there's enough 9 information in the ovarian cancer talc literature 10 to permit a fulsome assessment of biological 11 gradient/dose-response?</p> <p>12 A. That has been addressed in several 13 reports. Like, notably in the Health Canada 14 report, they talked about that and noted some of 15 the limitations in assessing the dose-response. 16 And it's recognized as an area where more complete 17 data would be desirable.</p> <p>18 Q. My question was: Do you agree with 19 the statement -- do you, Dr. Moorman, agree with 20 the statement that there is significant exposure 21 information lacking to permit a fulsome assessment 22 of biological gradient/dose-response?</p> <p>23 A. There are a lot of qualifiers in 24 there, and I -- I don't think that I would 25 necessarily agree with that statement.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 causal relationship between cosmetic talc 2 and each individual subtype of epithelial 3 ovarian cancer?)</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Same objection. Asked 5 and answered.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: You asked me earlier 7 today about certain subtypes, and my 8 response to that question was that most of 9 the studies reported on ovarian cancer as a 10 whole. Some studies did subtype analysis, 11 but most of it was based on ovarian cancer 12 across all subtypes.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. And that's why I'm asking you, do you 15 think that there's enough studies that address 16 subtypes in particular to reach a causal 17 conclusion about subtypes?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. That's exactly what I'm asking. 21 That's not what I asked before.</p> <p>22 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Broad. 23 Form. Asked and answered.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I -- you know, I have 25 stated what I believe the data show, that</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 we can -- that the bulk of the evidence is 2 based on ovarian cancer as a whole. And 3 I'm -- I -- I'm just -- I don't -- I think 4 that there -- there is some good subtype 5 data. It would certainly be desirable to 6 have more.</p> <p>7 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>8 Q. What -- do you think there's good 9 subtype data on clear cell carcinoma?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 11 answered. That was asked and specifically 12 answered.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I believe the question 14 you asked earlier today was -- was very 15 similar to that, and I -- you know, I did 16 reply. It's, like, the -- the data has 17 been reported in some studies by subtypes, 18 but the -- the most studies are -- have 19 been reporting by epithelial ovarian cancer 20 overall.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. I'm sorry. You said that there was 23 some science on subtypes. I'm asking you: What, 24 if any, science is there on the subtype of clear 25 cell cancer?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 the cellular level. And I fully 2 acknowledge I am not a laboratory 3 scientist, and so I looked at them from a 4 rather high level. But let's see. Let me 5 just --</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. So just to narrow it down, I don't 8 need all the studies you read. I just need to 9 know, what studies since 2019 do you -- are you 10 relying on to support your opinion that biological 11 plausibility is satisfied? And maybe the answer 12 is none. I don't know.</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, I do think 14 you made it clear, and I appreciate that. 15 And that would be: If you talked about it 16 pre-'19, you don't have to talk about it. 17 Jessica is asking specifically --</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: -- since 2019. And I 20 appreciate that, Jessica.</p> <p>21 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>22 Q. Since you didn't do a new Bradford 23 Hill analysis, I --</p> <p>24 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. Among</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 2 answered.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I believe that there 4 have been some studies that have report -- 5 reported on the subtypes. I'm having 6 difficulty recalling right off the top of 7 my head all of the results for all of the 8 individual subtypes, including clear cell.</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Can you recall any, any studies on 11 clear cell that you think show an association 12 between talc use and the development of ovarian 13 cancer?</p> <p>14 A. Right off the top of my head, I just 15 can't remember the results for the individual 16 subtypes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Can you tell me what papers 18 you're relying on for your biological plausibility 19 opinion since 2019?</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Thank you.</p> <p>21 MS. DAVIDSON: I knew Michelle would 22 love that.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: There have been several 24 papers that I have read since then that 25 address some of -- some of the -- mostly at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 other things, there have been several, 2 like, papers at the cellular level that I 3 looked at at a high level. You know, 4 Fletcher has reported some. Mandarino. I 5 believe it's "Emu" [sic]. Another thing 6 that I considered as part of the biological 7 plausibility was --</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. You said "Emu"? I think you meant 10 "Emi."</p> <p>11 A. I'm sorry.</p> <p>12 Q. E-M-I. Emu is an animal. Yeah.</p> <p>13 A. Thank you. I know that.</p> <p>14 And among other things that I think I 15 relied on in contributing to the biological 16 plausibility was some of the FDA analysis and the 17 finding of the asbestos in the talc products. And 18 then, you know, that, again, just kind of supports 19 another biological pathway.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know how many times the FDA has 21 analyzed J&J talc and not found asbestos?</p> <p>22 A. I do not know that. But I would say 23 that in a product that many women used for many 24 years, if they find it in 1 out of 10, 1 out of 25 100, you certainly don't want to be that woman</p>

<p>1 using that 1 out of 100 container, so any --</p> <p>2 Q. We're talking about biological</p> <p>3 plausibility --</p> <p>4 MS. PARFITT: Please let her finish,</p> <p>5 please.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: And, again, that -- so</p> <p>7 the fact that you have some -- any exposure</p> <p>8 to asbestos, which numerous -- several</p> <p>9 regulatory and scientific bodies have said</p> <p>10 there is no safe level, I would say that it</p> <p>11 does contribute to the biological</p> <p>12 plausibility. I don't know how common it</p> <p>13 is, but I would wager that most women would</p> <p>14 not want to take the risk of 1 out of 100</p> <p>15 containers has asbestos in it.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. We're talking about biological</p> <p>18 plausibility in that risk, right?</p> <p>19 A. We're talking about biological</p> <p>20 plausibility and its exposure to an agent that</p> <p>21 there is no safe level of exposure to.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Can you explain to me the</p> <p>23 biological mechanism by which you think talc</p> <p>24 causes ovarian cancer based on your review of the</p> <p>25 Fletcher, Mandarino and Emi papers?</p>	<p>Page 202</p> <p>1 called "Minerva"?</p> <p>2 A. I have heard of it. I wouldn't say</p> <p>3 that I'm very familiar with it.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know how many journals rejected</p> <p>5 Harper 2023 before they finally were able to</p> <p>6 publish in "Minerva"?</p> <p>7 A. I -- I don't know. Of course I don't</p> <p>8 know.</p> <p>9 Q. Are you aware that plaintiff's counsel</p> <p>10 have all the rejections from Harper 2023?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I am not aware --</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Relevance.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: -- of that.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. So plaintiff's counsel didn't share</p> <p>17 with you the many journals that rejected Harper</p> <p>18 2023, correct?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I already told you I do</p> <p>21 not -- do not have any of that.</p> <p>22 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>23 Q. If it's outside your area of expertise</p> <p>24 to analyze the reliability of papers like</p> <p>25 Fletcher, Mandarino and Emi, how can you offer an</p>
<p>1 A. As I have stated, I am not a</p> <p>2 laboratory scientist, and I looked at them at a</p> <p>3 very high level. Some of the things that they</p> <p>4 reported on were that it increases some redox --</p> <p>5 rather, some measures of oxidative stress and</p> <p>6 measure of inflammation.</p> <p>7 Q. Which paper is that?</p> <p>8 A. Again, if I can pull the papers out,</p> <p>9 it's -- I looked at them at a very high level</p> <p>10 and --</p> <p>11 Q. When you say you looked at them at a</p> <p>12 very high level, did you evaluate the reliability</p> <p>13 of the Fletcher and Harper papers?</p> <p>14 A. What -- what I have stated is that I'm</p> <p>15 an epidemiologist. I am not a laboratory</p> <p>16 scientist. And so when I go through and read</p> <p>17 those papers, it is outside my area of expertise</p> <p>18 to say if the experiments were done correctly,</p> <p>19 reliably. I -- you know, there's some assumption</p> <p>20 that, you know, it has gone through peer review by</p> <p>21 people who know the field. And so I'm just really</p> <p>22 not in a position -- I just don't have the</p> <p>23 expertise to judge all the specifics of the</p> <p>24 laboratory studies.</p> <p>25 Q. Are you familiar with the journal</p>	<p>Page 203</p> <p>1 opinion about biological plausibility?</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Your</p> <p>3 question was additional studies since 2019.</p> <p>4 As you know, she has testified on the issue</p> <p>5 of biological plausibility prior to 2019</p> <p>6 exhaustively in her deposition. I let you</p> <p>7 go forward because there were some studies</p> <p>8 that came out since that point.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you repeat the</p> <p>10 question?</p> <p>11 (The following question was read back:</p> <p>12 Q: If it's outside your area of</p> <p>13 expertise to analyze the reliability of</p> <p>14 papers like Fletcher, Mandarino and Emi,</p> <p>15 how can you offer an opinion about</p> <p>16 biological plausibility?)</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Objection. It does</p> <p>18 misstate her testimony.</p> <p>19 Please.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: My opinion on biological</p> <p>21 plausibility was based on a number of</p> <p>22 factors, including the movement of talc up</p> <p>23 the genital tract -- up the genital tract;</p> <p>24 the presence of a carcinogen, asbestos, in</p> <p>25 talc products; and then some other</p>

<p>1 potential mechanisms by which -- you know, 2 for example, inflammation and all, which is 3 a well-established mechanism of 4 carcinogenesis.</p> <p>5 So for those reasons, I think that 6 there are reasons why I can make a judgment 7 about biological plausibility.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. Does ovarian cancer typically 10 originate in the ovaries?</p> <p>11 A. There is data to suggest that some 12 ovarian cancers actually originate in the 13 fallopian tubes.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know what percent?</p> <p>15 A. I don't think that anybody would be 16 able to say that. That would mean being able to 17 determine there is an ovarian cancer from the 18 very -- very origin of the carcinogenic 19 transformation.</p> <p>20 Q. Sitting here in 2024, does the 21 scientific community generally believe that 22 ovarian cancer is caused by inflammation?</p> <p>23 MS. PARFITT: Objection as to what the 24 scientific community believes or doesn't 25 believe. What does that mean? That's so</p>	<p>Page 206</p> <p>1 with that.</p> <p>2 Q. So just to be clear, is it your 3 opinion that inflammation is involved in the 4 development of all cancers?</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Relevancy. 6 Form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I believe that the 8 general consensus is that inflammation is a 9 pathway involved in many cancer types. 10 Whether or not it is all cancers or not, I 11 don't -- I don't know. But I think that it 12 is a general consensus that inflammation is 13 part of the carcinogenic pathway.</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Can you point to any papers outside of 16 the context of talc stating that inflammation 17 causes ovarian cancer?</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 19 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay.</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: If you can understand 21 that.</p> <p>22 And I would also object based upon the 23 fact that during the deposition of 24 January 25, '19, she was examined with 25 regard to mechanism -- in particular,</p>
<p>1 broad.</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you. That's -- I 3 think you meant "Objection to form."</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: So please repeat the 5 question. Whenever the objections come in, 6 I kind of lose my train of thought.</p> <p>7 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah, they lose -- 8 that's their purpose.</p> <p>9 (The following question was read back: 10 Q: Sitting here in 2024, does the 11 scientific community generally believe that 12 ovarian cancer is caused by inflammation?)</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Again, I don't -- I 15 can't speak for the entire scientific 16 community. I think that it is well 17 established that inflammation is one of the 18 hallmarks of cancer, one of the pathways 19 to -- to cancer.</p> <p>20 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>21 Q. Is it one of the hallmarks of ovarian 22 cancer?</p> <p>23 A. Just in general, inflammation is 24 considered a hallmark of -- of cancer development, 25 and so ovarian cancer, I would group within --</p>	<p>Page 207</p> <p>1 inflammatory effects of talc --</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Uh-huh.</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: -- as it pertains to 4 ovarian cancer. So I think we've been down 5 this road --</p> <p>6 MS. DAVIDSON: That wasn't my 7 question.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. We're sitting here in 2024. Can you 10 point to any paper that's been published in the 11 literature, that does not involve talc, suggesting 12 that inflammation leads to ovarian cancer?</p> <p>13 MS. PARFITT: Objection.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Off the top of my head, 15 I could not point to -- to one. But, 16 again, there is a very large literature. 17 Inflammation in cancer is a topic that has 18 a huge literature.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Do you think it was inappropriate that 21 the authors of Taher assigned lower value to 22 case-control studies based on concerns of recall 23 bias?</p> <p>24 A. I think that it is -- as I have stated 25 previously, every study has strengths and</p>
	Page 209

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 limitations, and I would not make a judgment about 2 the quality of a study just based on the study 3 design. There can be very good case-control 4 studies; there can be very good cohort studies; 5 and conversely, there can be very poor ones.</p> <p>6 I think it is important to point out 7 that these case-control studies, if you look 8 through any textbook, any epidemiology textbook, 9 it will describe case-control studies as a -- 10 ideally designed to address diseases that are 11 relatively uncommon and have a long latency 12 period.</p> <p>13 So case-control studies are extremely 14 appropriate for the question at hand. And -- I'm 15 sorry. And so I wouldn't --</p> <p>16 Oh, the other point I was going to 17 make is that all or virtually all of the 18 case-control studies, they've gone -- undergone 19 peer review for funding. Many of them were funded 20 by the National Cancer Institute.</p> <p>21 So they are an appropriate design for 22 studying talc in ovarian cancer. And so I would 23 not give them a lower quality score just on that 24 basis that recall bias is a potential limitation 25 of case-control studies.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 Q. Is that a reputable journal? 2 A. Overall, it's a pretty well-respected 3 journal, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Have you ever published there? 5 A. I don't believe I have as a first 6 author. I might have as a co-author. I don't -- 7 don't recall exactly.</p> <p>8 Q. And as we discussed earlier, you're 9 not aware of any biases to the authors, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Any?</p> <p>11 Q. Bias.</p> <p>12 A. Any bias?</p> <p>13 Q. That these two authors have, are you?</p> <p>14 A. I don't -- I don't know of anything 15 that would -- would lead me to make that 16 conclusion.</p> <p>17 Q. They don't have any -- they don't 18 report conflicts of interest, correct?</p> <p>19 A. Well, conflicts of interest and bias 20 are not synonymous, but --</p> <p>21 Q. I'm asking another question.</p> <p>22 A. -- but they do not report conflicts of 23 interest.</p> <p>24 Q. And I take it from our prior 25 conversation, you're not aware that "Gynecologic</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 Q. My question was simply: Do you agree 2 or disagree with Taher?</p> <p>3 A. And so if he is giving a study a lower 4 quality score just because it's a case-control 5 study, I would disagree with that.</p> <p>6 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Let's move along 7 to Exhibit -- let's mark as Exhibit 16 8 Wentzensen and O'Brien 2021.</p> <p>9 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 16, Gynecologic 10 Oncology - Talc, body powder, and ovarian 11 cancer: A summary of the epidemiologic 12 evidence, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. Again, Exhibit 16 will be "Talc, body 15 powder, and ovarian cancer: A summary of 16 epidemiologic evidence," Nicolas Wentzensen, 17 Katie M. O'Brien. I think it's 2021.</p> <p>18 If you could turn to Page 9. You 19 discussed this paper in your most recent report in 20 2023, right?</p> <p>21 A. I believe I did, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Yes. Thank you.</p> <p>23 And where is this paper published?</p> <p>24 A. It's published in "Gynecologic 25 Oncology."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 Oncology" is one of the many papers that rejected 2 Dr. Fletcher, Harper, Saed's 2023 paper, right?</p> <p>3 A. I already told you I'm unaware of the 4 publication history of that paper.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. If we could turn to Page 9 of 6 this report, the authors state at the top of 7 Page 9: Given the inability to attribute a clear 8 causal factor to the observed associations, the 9 lack of a good experimental model, the lack of a 10 specific biomarker for powder-related 11 carcinogenesis, and the inability to rule out 12 confounding by indication, it is difficult to 13 conclude that the observed associations are 14 causal.</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. I do see that.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you include that discussion -- did 18 you reference that statement in your report?</p> <p>19 A. I did not reference that specific 20 statement, no.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you agree with the authors that any 22 association is, quote, "small"?</p> <p>23 A. I -- I'd prefer not to use adjectives 24 like "small." I think it's much more helpful just 25 to report what the relative risk is. It's a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 relative risk of 1.25, 1.3, whatever. I think 2 that that is a more accurate and preferable way to 3 do it.</p> <p>4 I would further state that in terms of 5 the public health impact, it is dependent both on 6 the -- the size of the relative risk and the -- 7 the prevalence of use of the exposure.</p> <p>8 Q. So you're -- just to be clear, you're 9 refusing to agree with these authors that the 10 association is small?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I would not agree with 13 that because I don't like to -- I would not 14 describe it with that adjective. I would 15 just report what the association is, 16 quantify it.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. Drs. Wentzensen and O'Brien state, 19 quote: We currently do not understand the causal 20 factors that underlie the observed weak 21 associations between genital powder use and 22 ovarian cancer risk.</p> <p>23 Do you disagree with that statement?</p> <p>24 A. Where are you reading from?</p> <p>25 Q. You're challenging my eyes again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 that statement?</p> <p>2 A. I mean, I -- I think that I would say 3 that we -- I neither totally agree nor totally 4 disagree with that in that our understanding of 5 most risk factors and cancer is not complete.</p> <p>6 But I think that we do have some 7 understanding of potential causal factors, like, 8 namely that asbestos is found in many talc 9 products. It's a carcinogen. So I kind of -- I 10 don't completely disagree nor agree with that 11 statement.</p> <p>12 Q. You just said that asbestos is found 13 in many talc products. What do you mean by 14 "many"?</p> <p>15 A. Based on analyses that I have seen, 16 analyses done by the plaintiff's expert, I have -- 17 back in the -- as we discussed earlier, I have 18 seen some documents -- internal documents from J&J 19 that noted that talc was found in some samples. 20 And the FDA also found talc in some samples, so...</p> <p>21 Q. Did the FDA find talc in many -- did 22 the FDA find asbestos in many batches of Johnson's 23 Baby Powder?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, if I 25 can -- she said "talc" in the product. Did</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 Further down the same paragraph, or maybe it's --</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you point to where 3 the sentence is?</p> <p>4 All right. I'm going to have to give 5 in to Michelle and get reading glasses. I 6 usually read the papers online where you 7 can make them bigger.</p> <p>8 MR. TRANGLE: It's on Page 8.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, the prior page.</p> <p>10 That's why.</p> <p>11 MR. TRANGLE: At the very, very end.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. Yeah.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. In summary -- sorry about that.</p> <p>15 MR. TRANGLE: Page 8 at the very end.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Bottom of Page 8. In summary, we 18 currently do not understand the causal factors 19 that underlie the observed weak association 20 between genital powder use and ovarian cancer 21 risk.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Sorry you had to type 23 that twice. I shouldn't have repeated it.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Anyway, do you agree or disagree with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 you mean "asbestos" in the product? 2 Everybody is getting tired.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I did mean --</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: We can take a break in 5 a few minutes.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Did --</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Yeah, please. So could 9 we -- maybe could you ask --</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Can you answer my question?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: I just want to get it 13 clear.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Again, I -- I know that 15 they -- they did find -- you know, their 16 report from 2020. The exact numbers, I am 17 not recalling off the top of my head.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Of all the lots that J&J has ever 20 tested of Johnson's Baby Powder, how many times 21 have they found asbestos?</p> <p>22 A. Of course that's an impossible 23 question to answer.</p> <p>24 Q. What do you mean? Of all the times 25 that the FDA has reported on testing of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 relative risk of 1.25, 1.3, whatever. I think 2 that that is a more accurate and preferable way to 3 do it.</p> <p>4 I would further state that in terms of 5 the public health impact, it is dependent both on 6 the -- the size of the relative risk and the -- 7 the prevalence of use of the exposure.</p> <p>8 Q. So you're -- just to be clear, you're 9 refusing to agree with these authors that the 10 association is small?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I would not agree with 13 that because I don't like to -- I would not 14 describe it with that adjective. I would 15 just report what the association is, 16 quantify it.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. Drs. Wentzensen and O'Brien state, 19 quote: We currently do not understand the causal 20 factors that underlie the observed weak 21 associations between genital powder use and 22 ovarian cancer risk.</p> <p>23 Do you disagree with that statement?</p> <p>24 A. Where are you reading from?</p> <p>25 Q. You're challenging my eyes again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 that statement?</p> <p>2 A. I mean, I -- I think that I would say 3 that we -- I neither totally agree nor totally 4 disagree with that in that our understanding of 5 most risk factors and cancer is not complete.</p> <p>6 But I think that we do have some 7 understanding of potential causal factors, like, 8 namely that asbestos is found in many talc 9 products. It's a carcinogen. So I kind of -- I 10 don't completely disagree nor agree with that 11 statement.</p> <p>12 Q. You just said that asbestos is found 13 in many talc products. What do you mean by 14 "many"?</p> <p>15 A. Based on analyses that I have seen, 16 analyses done by the plaintiff's expert, I have -- 17 back in the -- as we discussed earlier, I have 18 seen some documents -- internal documents from J&J 19 that noted that talc was found in some samples. 20 And the FDA also found talc in some samples, so...</p> <p>21 Q. Did the FDA find talc in many -- did 22 the FDA find asbestos in many batches of Johnson's 23 Baby Powder?</p> <p>24 MS. PARFITT: And, Jessica, if I 25 can -- she said "talc" in the product. Did</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 Further down the same paragraph, or maybe it's --</p> <p>2 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you point to where 3 the sentence is?</p> <p>4 All right. I'm going to have to give 5 in to Michelle and get reading glasses. I 6 usually read the papers online where you 7 can make them bigger.</p> <p>8 MR. TRANGLE: It's on Page 8.</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: Oh, the prior page.</p> <p>10 That's why.</p> <p>11 MR. TRANGLE: At the very, very end.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: Yeah. Yeah.</p> <p>13 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>14 Q. In summary -- sorry about that.</p> <p>15 MR. TRANGLE: Page 8 at the very end.</p> <p>16 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>17 Q. Bottom of Page 8. In summary, we 18 currently do not understand the causal factors 19 that underlie the observed weak association 20 between genital powder use and ovarian cancer 21 risk.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: Sorry you had to type 23 that twice. I shouldn't have repeated it.</p> <p>24 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Anyway, do you agree or disagree with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 you mean "asbestos" in the product? 2 Everybody is getting tired.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I did mean --</p> <p>4 MS. DAVIDSON: We can take a break in 5 a few minutes.</p> <p>6 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>7 Q. Did --</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: Yeah, please. So could 9 we -- maybe could you ask --</p> <p>10 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>11 Q. Can you answer my question?</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: I just want to get it 13 clear.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Again, I -- I know that 15 they -- they did find -- you know, their 16 report from 2020. The exact numbers, I am 17 not recalling off the top of my head.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Of all the lots that J&J has ever 20 tested of Johnson's Baby Powder, how many times 21 have they found asbestos?</p> <p>22 A. Of course that's an impossible 23 question to answer.</p> <p>24 Q. What do you mean? Of all the times 25 that the FDA has reported on testing of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 218</p> <p>1 Johnson's -- 2 A. Oh, you -- 3 Q. -- Baby Powder, how many times have 4 they reported finding -- 5 A. I don't -- I already answered it. I 6 said, I don't recall the exact numbers. 7 Q. And are you -- do you consider 8 yourself qualified to analyze the reliability of 9 the work done by plaintiff's asbestos expert? 10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form. 11 THE WITNESS: I have already stated 12 that I am not an expert in the mineral 13 science, and so I know that that will be 14 discussed further, and -- 15 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 16 Q. But you did say you're relying on his 17 work? 18 A. I am saying that that is part of what 19 I was considering. 20 Q. In reaching the conclusion that 21 asbestos is found in many talc products? 22 A. I mean -- yes. Yes. 23 Q. Other than J&J internal products, the 24 FDA's finding in 2020, and plaintiff's expert's 25 opinions, is there anything else you're relying on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 220</p> <p>1 MS. PARFITT: I can object -- 2 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 3 MS. PARFITT: -- to anything -- 4 MS. DAVIDSON: Object all you want. 5 MS. PARFITT: -- I find objectionable. 6 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's object all you 7 want. 8 Can you repeat the question? 9 MS. PARFITT: I will do that -- 10 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. 11 MS. PARFITT: -- Jessica -- 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Please do. 13 MS. PARFITT: -- as you will do -- 14 MS. DAVIDSON: Can you repeat the 15 question? 16 MS. PARFITT: -- when we take your 17 experts. Believe me, you will. 18 (The following question was read back: 19 Q: Other than J&J internal products, 20 the FDA's finding in 2020, and plaintiff's 21 expert's opinions, is there anything else 22 you're relying on for your opinion that 23 asbestos is found in, quote, "many talc 24 products"?) 25 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Previously</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 219</p> <p>1 for your opinion that asbestos is found in, quote, 2 "many talc products"? 3 MS. PARFITT: I'm going to object. 4 This was examined exhaustively in 2019. 5 This is a total redo. She answered those 6 questions -- 7 MS. DAVIDSON: She answered a 8 question. I'm asking a follow-up. 9 Michelle, that's ridiculous. 10 MS. PARFITT: You know what, Jessica? 11 Nothing I'm going to say is going to be 12 ridiculous. I'm making my objection. I'm 13 permitted to do so and -- 14 MS. DAVIDSON: The FDA thing happened 15 after her last deposition. 16 MS. PARFITT: Beg your pardon? 17 MS. DAVIDSON: The FDA thing happened 18 after her last deposition. We've never 19 discussed this. 20 MS. PARFITT: Did the others occur 21 before the last deposition? 22 MS. DAVIDSON: What does that matter? 23 You can't parse it like that. She made a 24 statement. I'm allowed to ask a follow-up 25 question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p> <p>1 examined during the deposition 2019. 2 It's not funny, Jessica. None of this 3 is funny. My ladies are dying that I 4 represent, so I find nothing funny about 5 this deposition, I must tell you. 6 THE WITNESS: I think that from the 7 standpoint of it is not -- okay. Yes, I am 8 relying on those three sources of data 9 that -- that were described in the 10 question. 11 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 12 Q. Okay. We can move on, then. I just 13 wanted to make sure there was nothing else. 14 The authors of O'Brien and Wentzensen 15 state: The low relative risk translates to a very 16 low absolute risk increase, given the rarity of 17 ovarian cancer. 18 Do you disagree with that statement? 19 A. I disagree with what it conveys. We 20 know that in -- ovarian cancer is a relatively low 21 incidence of cancer. But as several -- and there 22 have been some studies that have calculated the 23 population attributable risk for talc use and 24 ovarian cancer. And I -- if I'm recalling, some 25 of -- some reports have calculated the population</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 attributable risk as about 12 to 15 percent of 2 ovarian cancers, you know -- as you would 3 interpret the population attributable risk, if all 4 other factors were kept equal and you could 5 eliminate talc, you would be able to, in theory, 6 eliminate 12 to 15 percent of ovarian cancers.</p> <p>7 And so among the 20-some-thousand 8 ovarian cancers each year, eliminating 2,000, 9 3,000 of them by no talc use, I would say that 10 that is not a small absolute risk. You can 11 interpret the numbers in different ways, but I 12 think that the public health importance is -- is 13 quite large, and I think that that statement does 14 not convey that. It conveys that it's a 15 negligible impact, and I think that it's a big 16 impact.</p> <p>17 Q. Dr. Wentzensen and O'Brien have 18 devoted their careers to public health and cancer, 19 right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, as far as I know. I --</p> <p>21 Q. Have you --</p> <p>22 A. I --</p> <p>23 Q. Have you done any study of historical 24 patterns of talc use and whether they match 25 historical patterns of ovarian cancer?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 this many details from many studies, I can't swear 2 that it was there. That was the name that was 3 sticking in my mind, but --</p> <p>4 Q. In -- in their 2021 paper, Wentzensen 5 and O'Brien discuss the Schildkraut paper, right?</p> <p>6 A. I believe the Schildkraut paper was 7 certainly included in there. Was there a 8 specific -- I'm -- right off, I know that the 9 Schildkraut paper was one of the studies included 10 in here in the text.</p> <p>11 I'm -- I'm not putting my fingers on 12 any discussion of the Schildkraut paper. And I 13 just don't recall specifically whether -- how it 14 was mentioned, if it was mentioned in here.</p> <p>15 Q. It's mentioned on Page 5 under their 16 discussion of recall bias, wasn't it?</p> <p>17 A. Okay. Yes. Yes, I see.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you disagree with their analysis of 19 Schildkraut?</p> <p>20 A. They are recording the -- exactly what 21 we reported in our -- our papers, that, yes, there 22 was an attenuation of the odds ratio when the 23 analysis was limited to women who had completed 24 the questionnaire prior to 2014's. So --</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 A. I have not done such a study. And it 2 is -- it really would not be particularly 3 informative because of all the other risk factors 4 and how they might have changed over time as well.</p> <p>5 And so it's not like you could look 6 at -- keep all other risk factors static and then 7 talc went up or went down and how did it affect 8 it. I don't think that study would be 9 particularly informative.</p> <p>10 Q. What studies were you referring to in 11 terms of your testimony that some studies have 12 found an absolute percentage of talc cases that 13 they believe are caused by ovarian cancer [sic]?</p> <p>14 A. Let's see. Let me just double-check 15 that my -- I believe that the study by Wu might 16 have reported it. But, again, many studies and 17 all the specific details -- my eyes are so tired 18 that it's hard to read.</p> <p>19 I'm happy to take a couple -- I'm not 20 seeing it right in here. But I know that there 21 have been studies that have calculated the 22 population attributable risk.</p> <p>23 Q. But you're not sure whether or not 24 that's Wu?</p> <p>25 A. Again, you know, trying to remember</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 A. -- they're just stating what we stated 2 in our paper, basically.</p> <p>3 Q. At the top of Page 4, Wentzensen and 4 O'Brien say: The data suggests that there are 5 several etiologically distinct types of cancers 6 that manifest in the ovaries.</p> <p>7 Do you disagree with that statement?</p> <p>8 A. No. I think that -- I think that 9 their statement is accurate.</p> <p>10 Q. And "etiologically distinct types of 11 cancers" means cancers with different 12 pathogenesis?</p> <p>13 A. What I believe that they're referring 14 to is that some associations vary a bit by 15 subtype. So associations with risk factors vary 16 by subtype a bit.</p> <p>17 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>18 A. So, you know, if it's -- for example, 19 smoking is associated more strongly with some 20 ovarian cancer subtypes than others --</p> <p>21 Q. And they say: It's been proposed that 22 a majority of high-grade serous carcinomas arise 23 from the fallopian tubes, while endometrioid 24 carcinomas may arise from the orthotopic or 25 ectopic endometrial tissue.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 Do you agree with that statement?</p> <p>2 A. The -- the statement that that has</p> <p>3 been proposed, yes. That -- that has indeed been</p> <p>4 proposed.</p> <p>5 Q. And is there now a general view in the</p> <p>6 ovarian cancer science community that most</p> <p>7 high-grade serous carcinoma originates in the</p> <p>8 fallopian tubes?</p> <p>9 MS. PARFITT: Objection to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I -- I know that that is</p> <p>11 frequently reported in the literature, that</p> <p>12 many ovarian cancers, particularly the</p> <p>13 high-grade serous, arise in the fallopian</p> <p>14 tubes. Whether there is a consensus, I</p> <p>15 can't speak for the entire body of ovarian</p> <p>16 cancer scientists.</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. So you don't know whether there's a</p> <p>19 consensus right now on that topic?</p> <p>20 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and</p> <p>21 answered.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I know that that's</p> <p>23 frequently mentioned. But whether it could</p> <p>24 be characterized as a consensus, I -- I</p> <p>25 don't know.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 to this question. And it's kind of important.</p> <p>2 Will you be testifying at trial that</p> <p>3 inhaling talc can cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>4 A. Well, at this point, I don't even know</p> <p>5 that I -- I will be testifying at trial. As far</p> <p>6 as I know, there's no trial date set. I have not</p> <p>7 been asked at this point to testify at any trial.</p> <p>8 So I don't know what I would be testifying to.</p> <p>9 Q. Well, if you're offering an opinion</p> <p>10 about --</p> <p>11 MS. DAVIDSON: Can we go off the</p> <p>12 record.</p> <p>13 (Off-the-record conference.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>15 Q. As of today, February 2024, are you</p> <p>16 offering an opinion in this litigation that the</p> <p>17 inhalation of talc can lead to the development of</p> <p>18 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>19 A. I have offered an opinion about</p> <p>20 exposure to talc generally and ovarian cancer. I</p> <p>21 am focusing on the epidemiologic studies, and I'm</p> <p>22 not aware of any large-scale epidemiologic study</p> <p>23 that has reported on inhalation of talc in ovarian</p> <p>24 cancer.</p> <p>25 Q. Have there been any occupational</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>2 Q. Do you agree that many ovarian cancer</p> <p>3 risk factors and exposures are specific to certain</p> <p>4 subtypes?</p> <p>5 A. I'm not sure that I would agree with</p> <p>6 that adjective, "many." There are some</p> <p>7 differences by subtypes, but I don't know that I</p> <p>8 would agree with the "many."</p> <p>9 MS. DAVIDSON: All right. We've been</p> <p>10 going about an hour. Let's take a break.</p> <p>11 You seem tired.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I am tired.</p> <p>13 * * *</p> <p>14 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the</p> <p>15 proceedings from 4:26 p.m. to 4:46 p.m.)</p> <p>16 * * *</p> <p>17 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>18 Q. Are you offering an opinion in this</p> <p>19 litigation that the inhalation of talc can cause</p> <p>20 ovarian cancer?</p> <p>21 A. The opinion that I offered was related</p> <p>22 to talc exposure, and nearly all of the data are</p> <p>23 related to perineal exposure. And so that's where</p> <p>24 my opinion lies.</p> <p>25 Q. I'm not sure I understand the answer</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 studies that have looked at occupational exposure</p> <p>2 to talc and the development of ovarian cancer?</p> <p>3 MS. PARFITT: That was asked and</p> <p>4 answered earlier.</p> <p>5 MS. DAVIDSON: Asked and answered</p> <p>6 when?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: It was early on in the</p> <p>8 deposition when you were talking about</p> <p>9 occupational and nonoccupational exposure.</p> <p>10 MS. DAVIDSON: That was asbestos. We</p> <p>11 were talking about asbestos exposure. I'm</p> <p>12 talking about talc exposure.</p> <p>13 Michelle, please don't interrupt my</p> <p>14 questions when -- when what you're saying</p> <p>15 isn't even true. Try to listen carefully</p> <p>16 to the question.</p> <p>17 MS. PARFITT: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa,</p> <p>18 whoa, whoa, whoa.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. My question is --</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Don't say it isn't true.</p> <p>22 Some of your questions, Jessica, with all</p> <p>23 due respect, haven't been all that clear.</p> <p>24 MS. DAVIDSON: Thank you so much. I'm</p> <p>25 sure you would do better.</p>
<p>Golkow Litigation Services</p>	<p>Page 58 (226 - 229)</p>

<p>1 MS. PARFITT: I -- I'm not saying I 2 would do better.</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: Can -- can you 4 reread -- can you reread the question? Can 5 you read the question?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: I just want a clear 7 record, Jessica. I'm sure you do, too.</p> <p>8 MS. DAVIDSON: We have a clear record. 9 Can you read the question?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Well, let's get one. (The following question was read back: 11 Q: Have there been any occupational 12 studies that have looked at occupational 13 exposure to talc and the development of 14 ovarian cancer?)</p> <p>15 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 16 answered.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Again, the occupational 18 literature, I have not reviewed that in 19 quite a while. As -- I do recall -- I 20 believe that there have been studies of 21 occupational exposure to talc and ovarian 22 cancer, but I'm -- I haven't looked at 23 those -- those studies. And I'm trying -- 24 it's not clear in my mind right now what 25</p>	<p>Page 230</p> <p>1 BY MS. DAVIDSON: 2 Q. And you don't recall if that was 3 before or after your 2019 deposition? 4 A. No, I don't recall.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you know whether ovarian cancer 6 diagnoses have fallen in the last three decades? 7 A. Whether ovarian cancer diagnoses -- 8 Q. -- diagnoses have dropped in the last 9 three decades?</p> <p>10 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Again, you're asking me 12 to recall some data that I have looked at, 13 but the specific numbers I am not recalling 14 at this point.</p> <p>15 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>16 Q. As an epidemiologist in this area, I'm 17 asking whether you know whether ovarian cancer 18 rates have fallen in the last three decades.</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: And I -- I have answered 21 it, that I just don't -- I mean, I 22 certainly have looked at those numbers. 23 I'm just not recalling at this point 24 exactly what the -- the trends are.</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>
<p>1 the studies were, you know. 2 I looked at, I believe, both 3 occupational studies of talc, occupational 4 studies of asbestos. And because I haven't 5 looked at them in so long, I just can't 6 recall at this moment what was reported in 7 those studies.</p> <p>8 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>9 Q. Have you reviewed a paper from July 10 2023 titled Lisa Leung, "Occupational environment 11 and ovarian cancer risk"?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry. The author, again?</p> <p>13 Q. Lisa L-E-U-N-G.</p> <p>14 A. I am not recalling that paper 15 specifically.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you reviewed any literature since 17 2019 that you believe would support an opinion 18 that inhalation of talc can cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>19 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Asked and 20 answered.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I recall reading papers 22 that discussed that inhalation of talc and 23 movement through the body is possible. 24 I -- I just don't recall specifically where 25 I read that at this point in time.</p>	<p>Page 231</p> <p>1 Q. In your report, you mention multiple 2 letters to the editor by Dr. Egilman, correct, in 3 your two reports?</p> <p>4 A. I -- I know that I mentioned at least 5 one of them. I don't know that it was multiple 6 letters.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall how many times 8 Dr. Egilman has written letters to the editor that 9 you've cited in your various reports?</p> <p>10 A. No, I do not recall that.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know whether plaintiff's 12 counsel asked Dr. Egilman to write those letters?</p> <p>13 A. No, I do not know that.</p> <p>14 Q. How did you come to be retained in the 15 Zantac litigation?</p> <p>16 A. I was approached by Steve Rotman, an 17 attorney out of Boston, and I -- I don't know 18 precisely how he got my name or information. And 19 he talked to me about would I be interested in 20 reviewing the literature on this topic.</p> <p>21 And as it was at a time point where I 22 was close to retiring from Duke but we were still 23 pretty heavily in the midst of COVID in early 24 2021, that I agreed to look at the literature in 25 relation to that. So that's how it came about.</p>

<p>1 Q. When you did your expert report in 2 Zantac, did you explicitly assign different 3 weights to different studies?</p> <p>4 A. I discussed some of the studies that I 5 found more persuasive. I think you probably used 6 some phrasing that I weighted it more heavily or 7 not.</p> <p>8 Q. In fact, you used the terms "strong" 9 and "moderate" in terms of the weight you provided 10 to various studies, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, I -- I believe that I did.</p> <p>12 Q. Why didn't you do that here?</p> <p>13 A. I had not done that in the -- the 14 previous report, and so I was kind of keeping it 15 consistent with what I had done previously.</p> <p>16 Q. What previous report?</p> <p>17 A. In my previous report on talc.</p> <p>18 Q. I guess my question is: Why did you 19 do that in the Zantac litigation and not the talc 20 litigation?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I don't recall exactly 23 what the rationale was. I -- I just don't 24 recall the exact rationale for it.</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>	<p>Page 234</p> <p>1 A. I don't think that was fair. I don't 2 think that I -- I did that.</p> <p>3 Q. Have you been asked to provide expert 4 opinions in the state court litigation of Zantac?</p> <p>5 A. I'm not aware of any state court 6 litigation. I have not been approached.</p> <p>7 Q. Are you aware of any paper by an 8 independent scientist not associated with this 9 litigation that has concluded that talc use can 10 cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>11 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>12 MS. DAVIDSON: Do you want the 13 question repeated?</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yes, please repeat it 15 for me.</p> <p>16 (The following question was read back: 17 Q: Are you aware of any paper by an 18 independent scientist not associated with 19 this litigation that has concluded that 20 talc use can cause ovarian cancer?)</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: The Health Canada 23 report, I think they made the conclusion 24 that --</p> <p>25 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p>
<p>1 Q. Okay. The Zantac court criticized 2 your methodology on the ground that some of the 3 stated reasons for your analysis, such as length 4 of time, sample sizes, ascertainment of exposure, 5 were, quote, "inconsistently applied." Do you 6 think that was a fair criticism?</p> <p>7 A. No. I already told you that I did 8 not -- I did not agree with that decision, and I 9 think that I pretty explicitly described my 10 rationale for decisions that I made about each of 11 the studies.</p> <p>12 Q. The Zantac court was also concerned 13 that you ignored the authors' conclusions in some 14 of the studies that you cited. Was that a fair 15 criticism?</p> <p>16 A. I don't think that I ignored any of 17 the authors' conclusions. I think that there were 18 instances where I disagreed. And, again, when I 19 disagreed with the conclusion, I tried to explain 20 why I disagreed with that conclusion.</p> <p>21 Q. The Zantac court felt that you 22 selected data from studies that fit with your 23 ultimate opinion while simultaneously ignoring 24 data in the very same studies that did not fit 25 with your opinions. Was that a fair criticism?</p>	<p>Page 235</p> <p>1 Q. Is the Health Canada report --</p> <p>2 MS. PARFITT: Wait. She's --</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. -- a published paper in the scientific 5 literature?</p> <p>6 MS. PARFITT: -- she's in the middle 7 of -- she's in the middle of her response. 8 Please let her finish.</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. I think you might have misheard the 11 question.</p> <p>12 MS. PARFITT: No. Let her finish what 13 she was saying, and then you can say she 14 didn't hear your question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yeah. What I was 16 stating, I said, the Health Canada report 17 stated the available data are indicative of 18 a causal relationship.</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. Do you remember my question?</p> <p>21 A. Please repeat it for me, please.</p> <p>22 Q. Are you aware of any published paper 23 in the scientific literature by an independent 24 scientist who is not a paid expert in this 25 litigation concluding that talc can cause ovarian</p>

<p>1 cancer?</p> <p>2 A. Well, I would argue that this is in</p> <p>3 the scientific literature, that this was not done</p> <p>4 by a plaintiff expert, and it concluded that there</p> <p>5 was a causal relationship. They don't -- I don't</p> <p>6 recall if they specified who actually wrote the</p> <p>7 paper, but I would argue this is part of the</p> <p>8 scientific literature.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you know who wrote the Health</p> <p>10 Canada report?</p> <p>11 A. I just stated that I don't remember</p> <p>12 the -- if they -- I just don't remember</p> <p>13 specifically if they named the specific authors or</p> <p>14 not. I just don't remember that.</p> <p>15 Q. Did Health Canada -- was that Health</p> <p>16 Canada published in any peer-reviewed literature?</p> <p>17 A. I don't know that it was published in</p> <p>18 the peer-reviewed literature.</p> <p>19 Q. Does the Health Canada report rely in</p> <p>20 part on litigation reports by plaintiffs' experts?</p> <p>21 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: My understanding is that</p> <p>23 they considered some of the plaintiffs'</p> <p>24 expert reports as well as some of the -- I</p> <p>25 think also some of the defendant expert --</p>	<p>Page 238</p> <p>1 (The following question was read back:</p> <p>2 Q: Have you ever read a paper in the</p> <p>3 peer-reviewed scientific literature that</p> <p>4 relies on litigation expert reports?)</p> <p>5 MS. PARFITT: Object to the form.</p> <p>6 Broad.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I cannot recall that.</p> <p>8 I -- when I was reading that in the Health</p> <p>9 Canada report, it struck me as a little bit</p> <p>10 unusual. But I also thought that it was</p> <p>11 actually -- they were considering arguments</p> <p>12 made by scientists on either side of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 So I thought that it was a bit</p> <p>15 unusual, but I thought that it was perhaps</p> <p>16 the strength of their evaluation of all of</p> <p>17 the literature.</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Do you recall the Zantac court saying</p> <p>20 that no independent scientist or publication has</p> <p>21 concluded that ranitidine causes cancer?</p> <p>22 A. I -- I mean, that was a very long</p> <p>23 document, as you acknowledged. And do I recall</p> <p>24 that specific statement? I don't recall it.</p> <p>25 It's -- it might have been in there.</p>
<p>1 or some of what came from the defendants as</p> <p>2 well.</p> <p>3 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>4 Q. Have you ever read a paper in the</p> <p>5 peer-reviewed scientific literature that relies on</p> <p>6 litigation expert reports?</p> <p>7 MS. PARFITT: Objection. Misstates</p> <p>8 her testimony.</p> <p>9 You can answer the question.</p> <p>10 MS. DAVIDSON: It's not misstating any</p> <p>11 testimony. I'm asking.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: That's just -- can you</p> <p>14 repeat the question?</p> <p>15 Could you stop obstructing?</p> <p>16 MS. PARFITT: Jessica --</p> <p>17 MS. DAVIDSON: Go ahead.</p> <p>18 MS. PARFITT: -- please. We made it</p> <p>19 through a whole day. Don't characterize my</p> <p>20 objections, and I won't characterize your</p> <p>21 questions.</p> <p>22 MS. DAVIDSON: You just characterized</p> <p>23 the question -- mischaracterized it,</p> <p>24 actually.</p> <p>25 Go ahead.</p>	<p>Page 239</p> <p>1 Q. Are you aware of a single scientific</p> <p>2 body in the United States that has concluded that</p> <p>3 talc can cause ovarian cancer?</p> <p>4 A. I am not aware of that.</p> <p>5 Q. Has anyone who is not a plaintiff's</p> <p>6 expert written a letter criticizing either O'Brien</p> <p>7 2020 or O'Brien, Wentzensen 2021?</p> <p>8 A. I don't recall all the letters to the</p> <p>9 editor. I -- I am not aware of them other than</p> <p>10 the letters that I referenced in my report.</p> <p>11 Q. And the ones you referenced in your</p> <p>12 report were by plaintiffs' experts, correct?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. If a study asks women about talc use</p> <p>15 after the women have gone through menopause, that</p> <p>16 doesn't mean that the women did not use talc</p> <p>17 before menopause, correct?</p> <p>18 A. If they asked about talc use after</p> <p>19 menopause --</p> <p>20 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>21 A. -- it doesn't mean they didn't use it</p> <p>22 before menopause? Lots of negatives.</p> <p>23 No, it does not mean that. If they</p> <p>24 reported it after menopause, they could have used</p> <p>25 it -- depending on how the question was phrased,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 242</p> <p>1 they could have used it anytime throughout 2 their -- their life.</p> <p>3 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go off the 4 record.</p> <p>5 * * *</p> <p>6 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the 7 proceedings from 5:09 p.m. to 5:11 p.m.)</p> <p>8 * * *</p> <p>9 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>10 Q. I just have one other question, 11 subject to any questions from Michelle. If we 12 could go back to O'Brien 2020, which is Exhibit 2, 13 if I -- yeah, it's Exhibit 2. I'm not having a 14 senior moment today despite my blindness.</p> <p>15 If you can just look at the abstract 16 for O'Brien 2020, does this refresh your 17 recollection as to whether O'Brien 2020 had a 18 definition for "frequent talc use"? Under 19 "Exposures."</p> <p>20 A. Let's see.</p> <p>21 Q. I'm reading the abstract under 22 "Exposures."</p> <p>23 A. Long-term -- rather, "frequent," they 24 defined it as greater or equal to 1 time per week.</p> <p>25 Q. And O'Brien was published before</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 244</p> <p>1 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. Michelle. 2 MS. PARFITT: Thank you. 3 * * *</p> <p>4 EXAMINATION</p> <p>5 BY MS. PARFITT:</p> <p>6 Q. Just a couple, Doctor.</p> <p>7 Dr. Moorman, do you have knowledge 8 whether at the time that Dr. Harlow and 9 Dr. Rothman wrote their letters -- editorial 10 letters in response to the O'Brien paper, whether 11 or not they were retained plaintiffs' experts?</p> <p>12 A. I do not know when they were retained 13 as experts. So I can't say at that point whether 14 they were or -- or not.</p> <p>15 Q. All right. Also, did you have an 16 opportunity to review the reply by Katie O'Brien 17 to the letters to the editor written by Dr. Harlow 18 and Dr. Rothman?</p> <p>19 A. I did.</p> <p>20 Q. What was the nature of the reply by 21 Dr. O'Brien to the criticisms that were registered 22 by Dr. Harlow and Dr. Rothman?</p> <p>23 A. There were several points on which 24 Dr. O'Brien acknowledged that the -- the 25 criticisms raised by Dr. Harlow, Rothman and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 243</p> <p>1 Woolen, correct?</p> <p>2 A. This was 2020, and Woolen was -- was 3 later, yeah.</p> <p>4 Q. So both O'Brien and Davis define 5 "frequent" differently from Woolen, correct?</p> <p>6 A. What -- I -- we have talked about this 7 repeatedly and --</p> <p>8 Q. Well, we haven't talked about this at 9 all, actually.</p> <p>10 A. No. No. What I'm saying is, Woolen 11 was -- they used that cut point for a criteria 12 for including a study in their meta-analysis.</p> <p>13 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>14 A. And from there, the purpose of their 15 analysis was to -- what was -- to examine what was 16 the risk with the highest level of exposure.</p> <p>17 I don't think it was ever necessarily 18 their intention to look at 2 times a week or 19 greater. Their intent was to look at the highest 20 level of exposure in the studies.</p> <p>21 And so what -- this definition of 22 "frequent" in O'Brien, it is different than the 23 definition of what they considered the minimum 24 level of use for frequent use to be included in 25 their meta-analysis.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 245</p> <p>1 Cramer were valid. In particular, noted that the 2 misclassification in the cohort studies could have 3 resulted in an underestimate of the true relative 4 risk. And -- let's see. And they also addressed 5 the point about the -- reporting on the point 6 estimate and not relying just on the statistical 7 significance.</p> <p>8 MS. PARFITT: I don't have any further 9 questions. Thank you, Dr. Moorman.</p> <p>10 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's just mark 11 Dr. Harlow's letter as Exhibit --</p> <p>12 THE REPORTER: 17.</p> <p>13 MS. DAVIDSON: -- Exhibit 17.</p> <p>14 (MOORMAN EXHIBIT 17, Dr. Harlow's 15 letter in response to the O'Brien paper, 16 was marked for identification.)</p> <p>17 * * *</p> <p>18 EXAMINATION</p> <p>19 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>20 Q. I just marked the letter from -- I 21 just marked as Exhibit -- 17?</p> <p>22 MR. TRANGLE: 17.</p> <p>23 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>24 Q. -- the letter that Dr. Harlow wrote 25 to -- in response to the O'Brien paper. And you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 were just asked a minute ago by Ms. Parfitt 2 whether Dr. Harlow had yet been serving as a 3 litigation expert. Can you read the conflict of 4 interest disclosure for Dr. Harlow? 5 A. It says: Dr. Harlow reported 6 publishing research and serving as a consultant on 7 the topic of talc and ovarian cancer. No other 8 disclosures were reported. 9 Q. Does this indicate who Dr. Harlow was 10 serving as a consultant to? 11 A. No, it does not. 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Let's go off the record 13 for a minute. 14 * * *</p> <p>15 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the 16 proceedings from 5:17 p.m. to 5:19 p.m.) 17 * * *</p> <p>18 BY MS. DAVIDSON:</p> <p>19 Q. When -- when Drs. O'Brien and 20 Wentzensen published their paper in 2021, right, 21 that we talked about earlier today -- 22 A. Okay. 23 Q. -- in which they stated that it is 24 difficult to conclude that the observed 25 associations are causal, that was after they had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 on? 2 A. It does not. 3 Q. Does the conflict of interest noted in 4 the letters to the editor mention any conflict of 5 interest by Kenneth Rothman? 6 A. It does not. 7 Q. Does the letter to the editor, 8 Exhibit 17, reflect any conflict of interest by 9 Eleanor Murray? 10 A. It does not. 11 MS. PARFITT: I don't have any further 12 questions. 13 (WHEREUPON, the deposition was 14 concluded at 5:21 p.m.) 15 (Signature Reserved.)</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 received these letters to the editor and responded 2 to them, correct? 3 A. Let's see. Yeah. Yes. 4 MS. DAVIDSON: Okay. I don't have any 5 further questions. 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. 7 * * *</p> <p>8 EXAMINATION</p> <p>9 BY MS. PARFITT:</p> <p>10 Q. Dr. Moorman, if you would kindly refer 11 to Exhibit Number 17 again. It was the letter to 12 the editor by Dr. Harlow and Dr. Rothman. 13 A. Uh-huh. 14 Q. Do you have that in front of you? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. All right. You were asked by counsel 17 with regard to the disclosures of conflicts of 18 interest. Would you read that into the record, 19 please? 20 A. Okay. Dr. Harlow reported publishing 21 research and serving as a consultant on the topic 22 of talc and ovarian cancer risk. No other 23 disclosures were reported. 24 Q. Okay. Does that reflect which side 25 Dr. Harlow was reporting a conflict of interest</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2 Case Caption: In Re: Johnson & Johnson Talcum 3 Power Products Marketing, Sales Practices, and 4 Products Liability Litigation</p> <p>5 DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY</p> <p>6 I declare under penalty of perjury 7 that I have read the entire transcript of 8 my deposition taken in the captioned matter 9 or the same has been read to me, and the 10 same is true and accurate, save and except 11 for changes and/or corrections, if any, as 12 indicated by me on the DEPOSITION ERRATA 13 SHEET hereof, with the understanding that I 14 offer these changes as if still under oath.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 Signed on the _____ day of 18 _____, 20____.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 PATRICIA G. MOORMAN, Ph.D.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

<p>1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>3 _____</p> <p>4 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>5 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>6 _____</p> <p>7 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>8 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>9 _____</p> <p>10 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>11 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>12 _____</p> <p>13 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>14 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>15 _____</p> <p>16 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>17 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>18 _____</p> <p>19 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>20 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>23 SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____</p> <p>24 PATRICIA G. MOORMAN, Ph.D.</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 250</p> <p>1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA</p> <p>2 COUNTY OF CABARRUS</p> <p>3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE</p> <p>4 I, Cindy A. Hayden, RMR, CRR, a Notary Public, do hereby certify that there came before me on February 13, 2024, the person hereinbefore named who was by me duly sworn to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth of his or her knowledge concerning the matters in controversy in this cause; that the witness was thereupon examined under oath, the examination reduced to typewriting under my direction, and the deposition is a true record of the testimony given by the witness.</p> <p>5 I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to, or employed by any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action.</p> <p>6 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand this 26th day of February, 2024.</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 Cindy A. Hayden, Notary Public Notary Public Number 20020910053</p> <p>25</p>
--	--

<p>1 DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>3 _____</p> <p>4 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>5 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>6 _____</p> <p>7 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>8 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>9 _____</p> <p>10 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>11 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>12 _____</p> <p>13 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>14 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>15 _____</p> <p>16 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>17 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>18 _____</p> <p>19 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>20 Page No. _____ Line No. _____ Change to: _____</p> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 Reason for change: _____</p> <p>23 SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____</p> <p>24 PATRICIA G. MOORMAN, Ph.D.</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 251</p>
--	-----------------

<u>WORD INDEX</u>	242:24	134:1, 7	12:10 119:5	17 5:22
	1,258 64:10	162:22	12:59 119:6	65:23
	1.0 60:1	163:7, 12, 17, 19 , 25	120 5:4	245:12, 13, 14 , 21, 22
< \$ >	65:25 66:1	164:20, 22	125,000	247:11
\$120,000	67:10, 11	190:14	12:14	248:8
12:17	1.01 77:16	201:24	127 5:6	17,000
\$17,000	85:16	10:29 66:20	12-month	13:11 14:3
13:24	1.02 74:9,	10:52 66:20	13 1:15	171 5:12
\$200,000	11, 20, 21	100 201:25	173 5:16	8:18
	75:14, 22	202:1, 14	5:12 26:6	1825 3:3
	76:5, 10	10001-8602	72:9, 12, 24	1835 3:13
< 0 >	94:12	3:18	92:16, 21	189 5:17
0.63 91:5	1.05 62:9	102,000	171:16, 17, 22 190:14,	165:17
	1.08 59:11	12:13	19 18:19	0.86 85:18
	77:13	104 4:23	208:24	1.13 59:12
		11 5:9	19103 3:14	134 5:6
< 1 >	77:15 85:16	13th 2:7	< 2 >	1.15 85:18
1 4:11 5:6,	1.16 164:16	93:1, 10	2 4:11 5:6	9 18:24
	1.17 77:14	153:8, 16, 17	18:24 19:3	19:3 25:4,
	92:9	156:22	58:9, 10	5 26:3, 7
	1.19 94:5	14 5:16	59:6 61:9	11/15/23
	1.20 62:11	157:7	63:1, 3, 8	20 180:1, 9,
	1.22 117:2	173:14, 19,	74:13 76:3,	183:8
	1.23 165:15	156:22	4, 5 85:20	77:12
	1.25 214:1	14/16/18	93:8, 20	26:11
	1.26 77:16	20 180:1, 9,	104:19	13/14/15
	85:17	13 182:8	115:2	184:6
	1.27 154:14	183:8	117:3	184:6
	1.3 214:1	188:6, 22	126:24, 25	184:6
	1.40 154:19	189:21	127:8, 18	184:6
	1.42 94:12	192:23	130:15	184:6
	1.53 117:3	15 5:17	146:24	184:6
	1.58 124:15	192:23	152:15, 18	184:6
	125:2	130:22	153:16, 18,	15/16/17
	126:13	137:19	20 155:14	184:6
	1.89 92:10	138:4, 17	157:7	184:6
	1.98 94:5	141:4	168:11	184:6
	1.99 94:13	145:14	174:6	184:6
	10 5:6	151:18, 25	187:8	184:6
	14:4 70:7	155:1, 2, 6,	194:17	184:6
	72:9, 24	155:1, 2, 6,	201:24	184:6
	94:10, 12	156:6, 18, 24,	202:1, 14	184:6
	95:3, 14, 22	25 157:8, 12,		184:6
		14, 21, 23		
		16-		
		2738(MAS)(
		RLS 1:7		
		16th 44:2		
		158:2, 8, 17		
		159:11, 19		
		162:18		

164:20, 23	2016 33:20	43:6, 14	213:2	27 180:8, 13
165:2, 12	173:18	44:25 69:7,	231:10	182:4, 12
170:5	2016-ish	12, 15, 18	2024 1:15	183:11
173:7	33:9	82:25	2:7 25:14,	185:2, 3, 22
184:18, 23	2018 8:14	112:14	15, 16 26:6,	186:1, 20
242:12, 13	18:19 44:1,	115:24	12 55:23	188:7, 23
243:18	2 45:24	211:8, 17	56:1, 15	190:2
2,000 222:8	64:14	224:4	206:20	28 179:9
2,213 64:5	111:15	233:24	207:10	2900 3:13
2.12 164:19	2019 18:14	241:7	209:9	
2.20 124:18	19:9 20:2,	246:20	228:15	<3>
125:1	22 22:8	2022 13:9	252:6, 21	3 4:13
2.41 165:18	27:8 45:3,	15:19	20-plus	69:4, 6, 9, 15
2.65 91:6	25 89:16	21:20	94:1, 15, 25	82:20, 25
2:00 160:14,	90:9	119:15	95:12	116:4, 17
15	109:15	133:25	20-some-	179:25
2:01 161:5	110:25	134:6	thousand	180:22
2:07 161:5	111:19, 23	2023 13:8,	222:7	3,000 222:9
2:30 160:16	147:25	24 27:13, 20	21 4:16	3:16 177:11
2:31 177:11	199:19	43:18	69:12	30 83:21
20 60:13	200:9, 19	44:25 46:2	173:12	162:23
70:7 94:10,	205:3, 5	69:3 79:4	175:3	164:1
12 95:3, 15,	219:4	81:18	182:13	165:10, 11
21, 22	221:1	82:12	211 2:6	176:14
111:12	231:17	87:12	5:17	192:22
163:8, 9, 12,	232:3	102:20	212.735.2588	30s 78:20
16, 18, 25	202.783.6400	103:13	3:19	176:10, 14
165:9	3:4	104:9, 18, 20	215.985.9177	177:3
174:14	2020 58:9	105:3, 5	3:14	31 177:2
175:5	71:24	112:2	24 92:16, 21	316 3:8
186:24	83:16	117:5	93:1	32502 3:9
249:18	89:11 90:3	119:9	244 4:4	33 65:17
200 8:20	130:21	130:2	245 4:5	179:11
20006 3:4	191:24	171:13, 24	5:22	343 174:13
20020910053	192:14	172:25	247 4:6	383 181:14
252:25	217:16	173:5	25 4:11	
2005 18:7	218:24	177:18, 19	208:24	<4>
2009 161:16,	220:20	178:25	2531 149:18,	4 4:16
24, 25	241:7	184:23	19, 21, 22	61:18, 23
2009-ish	242:12, 16,	189:11	257,044 59:6	62:15 63:6
33:13	17 243:2	191:23	26 4:13	82:21, 22, 23
2014's	2021 4:16	192:13	69:10, 16	83:3, 8
224:24	9:22 10:3	204:5, 10, 18	26th 252:21	92:7 96:17
	11:13 13:7	211:20		155:8, 10, 17

156:7, 12	63	132:9	917.591.5672	25 122:2, 3, 9, 11, 16, 18	actual
225:3		164:18	1:19		57:18
4:26 227:15	69	4:13	92 62:11		168:20
4:46 227:15			94 92:20	48:20	add 23:9
40 12:14		<7>	95 85:16, 18		24:12 32:23
128:14, 21	7	5:1	92:21	178:20	added 64:21
130:4		115:16, 17,	97 117:3		Addendum
400 15:12		24 116:8	98 96:15, 20	12:22 81:4,	4:13 69:9,
403(b) 14:22		148:9, 12	98:20	24 87:1	16
40-ish 9:23		155:10	99 77:14	118:3	addition
40s 78:22		167:17, 19	85:17	156:10	47:13
176:11	71	94:5		185:23	additional
	73	74:7	<A>	188:23	205:3
<5>		92:10	a.m 2:8	214:2	additions
5 4:20		193:6	9:5 40:7	225:9	44:10
70:7 90:9,		194:17	66:20	249:10	address
10, 16	74	74:8	AACR 5:1		61:23
145:16	76	64:8	115:17	38:17	64:21, 24
151:19			able 112:1	177:24	81:12 82:3,
224:15		<8>	131:5	179:2	9 94:16, 24
5:09 242:7	8	5:4	133:10		97:9
5:11 242:7		119:20, 22,	204:5	30:23	101:19
5:17 246:16		25 120:3	206:16		105:1, 12
5:19 246:16		148:9	222:5	97:1	108:3
5:21 248:14		215:8, 15, 17	above-	125:24	130:15
550 174:12	83	4:16	entitled 2:2	200:2	133:8, 10
58 4:11		850.435.7000	absolute		190:25
		3:9	221:16	d 240:23	192:5, 10, 15
<6>		877.370.3377	222:10	244:24	197:15
6 4:3, 23		1:19	223:12	acknowledg	199:25
5:17		8s 147:9	absolutely	ments 48:8	210:10
104:10, 11,			53:3 161:2	120:25	addressed
16 119:10		<9>	abstract	ACOG 21:9,	21:2 55:7
180:10	9	5:6	242:15, 21	11, 15 22:2,	56:5 78:25
181:5, 8		127:15, 16,	abstracted	9, 11 31:10	82:13
183:20		17 147:9	158:19	32:21	96:12 97:6
184:13		211:18	acceptable	ACOG's	108:14
185:7, 22		213:5, 7	113:20	22:12	109:3
186:20	9:05	2:8	access 17:6	action 2:2	190:6, 10, 13
187:10	9:09	9:5	25:19	252:19	191:24
188:7, 20	9:10	9:5	114:2, 13	activities	195:12
189:6, 8, 11,	9:43	40:7	116:11	16:23	245:4
15	9:50	40:7	121:18, 19,		
61,000	64:7	90 4:20			

addresses	81:12 82:9,	216:3, 10	165:7	51:21
61:24	15 132:24	226:1	166:5	60:23
174:2 179:5	173:1, 6, 8,	227:2, 5, 8	169:13, 17	66:10
addressing	12 174:2, 6	235:8	171:3	73:25
89:22 109:1	175:2, 5	agreed	179:1	75:11
adequate	176:14, 15,	172:2	197:10	79:12 80:4
28:13	16, 17, 23, 24	233:24	200:23	85:9
adequately	190:14, 15,	ahead	201:16	109:19
146:15	16 192:6	116:20	224:18, 23	118:19, 21
adjective	agent	239:17, 25	235:3	142:12, 18
214:14	202:20	al 119:18	243:15	172:12
227:6	ages 81:21	134:2 162:9	analyze	200:11
adjectives	82:4 131:4,	albeit 95:9	137:24	217:11, 23
213:23	11, 20	allow 105:9	159:3	227:25
adjunct	ago 16:10,	118:3	204:24	239:9
18:2, 6, 12	17 17:2	allowed	205:13	answered
adjusted	37:8 53:25	42:19	218:8	41:20
59:8, 15, 25	66:25 70:7,	169:16	analyzed	42:12
77:12	8 99:12	172:11	115:7	50:16
154:13	192:6	219:24	156:1	56:11
adolescence	196:15	aloud 84:7	201:21	60:20, 21
180:15	246:1	amount	analyzing	61:7, 8
182:14	agree 8:6	8:16 9:22	97:21	75:25 76:2,
advise 22:14	20:19	15:8 108:3	Ancestry	13 108:6
advocated	26:19	129:6 130:8	5:2 19:13	110:1, 2, 4
41:7	30:19	analyses	115:20	118:8, 9, 17
affect	47:16 60:6	106:13	116:3	139:12
114:18	61:2 85:8,	110:7	and/or	140:7, 9, 12
129:17	25 86:8, 11	111:2	249:11	142:11, 15
136:7 223:7	101:6	216:15, 16	Angeles	159:24
African 5:2	106:15	analysis	5:12	194:2
19:13	118:13	44:6, 13, 16	161:19	196:15
115:20	136:20	62:18	162:11	197:5, 23
116:3	141:5	64:11 73:1	animal	198:11, 12
African-	147:3	78:2 89:19	201:12	199:2
American	165:11	90:3, 6	Anna 162:9	218:5
115:10	175:7	99:17	answer	219:5, 7
116:22	178:1, 16	104:23	6:21 12:19	226:21
117:7, 11, 16	188:9, 16	112:10	34:22 36:3,	229:4, 5
afternoon	195:18, 19,	129:17	5, 7, 25 38:7,	230:17
7:4	25 211:1	138:20	16, 24 39:3,	231:20
age 72:24	213:21	154:2, 5, 8	13, 20, 23, 25	232:20
78:21 79:2,	214:9, 12	155:23	42:14, 18, 21	answering
3, 5 80:18	215:25	160:1, 5	44:8 50:21	158:23

anxiously	appropriate	123:15, 21 136:2 188:8	asher.trangle @skadden.co	asking 34:6, 11, 13 37:24
176:2	49:5 74:2		m 3:20	47:6 50:17
anybody	144:9		asked 10:5	68:16 80:1, 13, 14 81:11, 14 82:2
51:17	210:14, 21	43:23 45:1, 7 46:1, 3, 9, 17, 23 90:23	17:8, 14 34:18	109:11
68:24 70:6	153:5	122:3	35:10	123:9
206:15		123:8, 10	39:16	141:6, 9
anymore	approved	145:22	42:11	142:7, 9
131:24	16:5	99:22, 24	50:16	177:4
anytime	approximatel	101:17, 22,	55:12	186:18
242:1	y 115:2	25 102:3, 5,	67:5 72:6	188:18, 19, 24 189:16
Anyway	130:4	9, 14 107:2,	75:3, 24	197:14, 20
215:25	April 4:16	8, 15, 22, 24	79:4 82:14	198:23
apologies	69:12	108:3, 11, 16	84:17 85:1,	200:17
163:23	Area 4:13,	110:13, 17,	3 87:21	212:21
apologize	18 58:11	112:10	97:16	219:8
66:2 127:3	59:14 79:1	113:2, 3	101:23	232:11, 17
Apologizing	82:11 83:4,	114:1, 3	102:24	239:11
177:13	9 85:23	115:22, 24	108:5	
apparently	86:17 87:8	116:3, 11, 16	110:1, 3	asks 241:14
130:10	106:14	117:13, 17,	113:18	aspect 97:22
155:3, 21	109:8, 10	118:10	118:7, 16	assembled
APPEARAN	110:21	119:1	124:3	45:8
CES 3:1	190:18	120:23	140:6	assembly
appears	195:16	121:1, 21	142:11	47:13
26:8	203:17	122:9, 21	159:23	assess
apples-to-	204:23	123:16	159:23	147:18
apples	205:12	124:1	160:1	196:11, 25
150:21	232:16	125:1	161:1	assessing
151:1	areas	126:1	162:1	195:15
applied	116:23	127:1	163:1	assessment
146:5 235:5	argue 238:2,	128:1	164:1	147:3
applying	7	ascertainmen	165:1	195:10, 21
146:20	arguments	t 235:4	166:1	196:3
148:21	20:15	Ashbrook	167:1	assessments
appointment	240:11	121:4	168:1	170:3
18:12	arises 183:4	ASHCRAFT	169:1	assign 49:7,
appreciable	ARPS 3:15	3:2 121:4	170:2	9 234:2
96:22	arrive 26:24	ASHER	171:1	assigned
appreciate	article 34:5	3:17 25:20	172:1	49:16, 17
177:15	94:20	26:4 46:10	173:1	114:19
200:14, 20	114:5, 8	69:5 127:7	174:1	
approached	121:18, 21	172:21	175:1	
233:16	122:5		176:1	
236:6			177:1	
			178:1	
			179:1	
			180:1	
			181:1	
			182:1	
			183:1	
			184:1	
			185:1	
			186:1	
			187:1	
			188:1	
			189:1	
			190:1	
			191:1	
			192:1	
			193:1	
			194:1	
			195:1	
			196:1	
			197:1	
			198:1	
			199:1	
			200:1	
			201:1	
			202:1	
			203:1	
			204:1	
			205:1	
			206:1	
			207:1	
			208:1	
			209:1	
			210:1	
			211:1	
			212:1	
			213:1	
			214:1	
			215:1	
			216:1	
			217:1	
			218:1	
			219:1	
			220:1	
			221:1	
			222:1	
			223:1	
			224:1	
			225:1	
			226:1	
			227:1	
			228:1	
			229:1	
			230:1	
			231:1	
			232:1	
			233:1	
			234:1	
			235:1	
			236:1	
			237:1	
			238:1	
			239:1	
			240:1	
			241:1	
			242:1	
			243:1	
			244:1	
			245:1	
			246:1	
			247:1	
			248:1	
			249:1	
			250:1	
			251:1	
			252:1	
			253:1	
			254:1	
			255:1	
			256:1	
			257:1	
			258:1	
			259:1	
			260:1	
			261:1	
			262:1	
			263:1	
			264:1	
			265:1	
			266:1	
			267:1	
			268:1	
			269:1	
			270:1	
			271:1	
			272:1	
			273:1	
			274:1	
			275:1	
			276:1	
			277:1	
			278:1	
			279:1	
			280:1	
			281:1	
			282:1	
			283:1	
			284:1	
			285:1	
			286:1	
			287:1	
			288:1	
			289:1	
			290:1	
			291:1	
			292:1	
			293:1	
			294:1	
			295:1	
			296:1	
			297:1	
			298:1	
			299:1	
			300:1	
			301:1	
			302:1	
			303:1	
			304:1	
			305:1	
			306:1	
			307:1	
			308:1	
			309:1	
			310:1	
			311:1	
			312:1	
			313:1	
			314:1	
			315:1	
			316:1	
			317:1	
			318:1	
			319:1	
			320:1	
			321:1	
			322:1	
			323:1	
			324:1	
			325:1	
			326:1	
			327:1	
			328:1	
			329:1	
			330:1	
			331:1	
			332:1	
			333:1	
			334:1	
			335:1	
			336:1	
			337:1	
			338:1	
			339:1	
			340:1	
			341:1	
			342:1	
			343:1	
			344:1	
			345:1	
			346:1	
			347:1	
			348:1	
			349:1	
			350:1	
			351:1	
			352:1	
			353:1	
			354:1	
			355:1	
			356:1	
			357:1	
			358:1	
			359:1	
			360:1	
			361:1	
			362:1	
			363:1	
			364:1	
			365:1	
			366:1	
			367:1	
			368:1	
			369:1	
			370:1	
			371:1	
			372:1	
			373:1	
			374:1	
			375:1	
			376:1	
			377:1	
			378:1	
			379:1	
			380:1	
			381:1	
			382:1	
			383:1	
			384:1	
			385:1	
			386:1	
			387:1	
			388:1	
			389:1	
			390:1	
			391:1	
			392:1	
			393:1	
			394:1	
			395:1	
			396:1	
			397:1	
			398:1	
			399:1	
			400:1	
			401:1	
			402:1	
			403:1	
			404:1	
			405:1	
			406:1	
			407:1	
			408:1	
			409:1	
			410:1	
			411:1	
			412:1	
			413:1	
			414:1	
			415:1	
			416:1	
			417:1	
			418:1	
			419:1	
			420:1	
			421:1	
			422:1	
			423:1	
			424:1	
			425:1	
			426:1	
			427:1	
			428:1	
			429:1	
			430:1	
			431:1	
			432:1	
			433:1	
			434:1	
			435:1	
			436:1	
			437:1	
			438:1	
			439:1	
			440:1	
			441:1	
			442:1	
			443:1	
			444:1	
			445:1	
			446:1	
			447:1	
			448:1	

148:18	214:21	authors	average	45:20, 24
209:21	225:14, 15	39:9 48:24	121:13	55:9 56:14
assigning	246:25	50:11	132:10	61:1 67:8
151:9	assume	59:22 68:4,	173:1, 6, 11	75:5 80:22
assistant	6:25	14 91:1	176:15, 16,	89:10, 15
18:25 19:1	112:13	97:19 98:1,	17, 22, 24	91:17, 25
associate	113:20	3 114:23	190:17, 23	114:13
18:6	assumption	115:2	191:18, 20	118:11
associated	203:19	120:12	aware	127:10
131:3, 10, 19	assure	134:14	15:23, 25	130:21
225:19	attached	136:10	21:19 22:2,	157:19
236:8, 18	99:9	137:18	18 23:1, 7	160:4, 25
Association	attenuated	138:25	27:12, 15, 19	164:11
4:11, 21	126:4	139:18	45:2 50:1	167:15, 22
5:6, 16	attenuation	143:16, 22	54:21 68:3,	173:5
27:21	224:22	144:13	13, 24 80:17	194:7
58:10	attorney	145:8	81:11	196:23
59:23 60:2,	233:17	151:12	87:16, 18	205:11
7 61:3, 10	252:16, 17	170:25	103:12, 15,	207:9
67:19, 25	attributable	171:2	16 107:12	216:17
68:1 74:12,	221:23	172:3	108:22	220:18
14 85:22	222:1, 3	188:11	135:3	230:11
86:9, 13, 16	223:22	209:21	138:2	236:16
87:7 90:12,	attribute	212:9, 13	140:4	240:1
17 91:11, 20	213:7	213:6, 21	167:3	242:12
92:18, 22	author	214:9	168:21	background
93:3, 11, 16	19:12 33:9	221:14	169:4	107:1, 5
94:2 95:1	40:24 48:1	235:13, 17	204:9, 12	136:17, 22
115:9	90:19	238:13	212:9, 25	156:11
117:7	96:20	author's	228:22	bad 163:23
120:19	106:1	113:22	236:5, 7, 17	balanced
125:8	114:7	161:9	237:22	133:18
131:6, 16	115:3, 4, 25	availability	241:1, 4, 9	ballpark
134:3, 7	134:17, 18	117:25	< B >	175:6
173:16, 20	149:25	168:15	Baby 7:15,	bankruptcy
193:25	173:18	169:3	43:20, 21	43:20, 21
194:13	177:22	available	19, 22 58:5	based 56:7,
196:11, 25	212:6	8:7 9:7	101:16	25 73:1
199:11	231:12	105:8	216:23	88:18 91:4,
213:22	authored	121:22	217:20	7 102:10, 17
214:10, 15	19:7, 10	122:8, 10	218:3	103:3
215:19	authority	130:11	back 8:14	106:24
associations	31:17, 23	237:17	31:21	117:21
213:8, 13			33:20 42:6	118:25

143:17, 21	42:13 47:7	224:6	biased 53:8, 11 54:4	blindness
144:14	54:3 56:1,	225:13	71:9 178:7	242:14
145:10	16, 19 60:20	230:21	biases	board
167:8	61:17	231:2, 17		132:18
169:2, 23	62:16, 20	234:11	104:21, 24	bodies 202:9
179:24	63:9 64:16	believes	105:2, 13, 25	body 5:20
197:11	71:23 72:9	206:24	106:4 212:9	31:3
198:2	74:16	bellwether	116:23	
202:24	76:25	57:3, 13, 22	139:6	
205:21	81:20	Berg 89:17,	222:15	141:7
208:22	83:12 89:5	24	bigger 67:2	183:16
209:22	90:1 96:5	Berga	215:7	211:10, 14
210:2	99:11	89:17, 24	billed 9:14,	226:15
216:15	100:2	B-E-R-G-E-	24 15:8, 10	231:23
baseline	102:8	N 89:17	binders	241:2
130:24	106:11	best 12:22	44:20, 23, 24	Boston
180:9	107:1	125:7	45:4, 8, 18	233:17
basic 71:13	110:14	better 24:2	biologic	bottom
basically	111:9, 25	71:20	102:4	149:19, 22
14:2 71:16	112:9, 11	111:21	biological	215:17
97:15	114:4	142:13	102:2, 6	Bradford
141:23	119:11, 19	193:20	44:5, 13, 16	
143:7	130:22	229:25	99:17	
146:5 225:2	131:12	230:2	200:22	
basis 48:14	134:15, 22	beyond	break 40:3	
50:19	136:3	34:8 35:21	66:15 67:6	
53:16 54:6	139:11	bias 47:18,	116:14	
210:24	140:10	20, 22, 23, 25	19, 23 205:1,	
batches	155:11, 12,	69:20	5, 16, 20	160:11, 13,
216:22	25 173:14	70:15	17 177:8, 14	
Baylen 3:8	176:12	71:18	206:7	217:4
Beg 219:16	183:3, 13	96:22 97:2,	biologically	227:10
beginning	190:5	3 105:14, 18,	102:6	breakdown
85:4	197:25	19, 20, 21, 22,	biomarker	59:18
135:24	198:13	24 106:2	213:10	
176:16	199:3	149:11	bit 13:9	breastfeeding
begins 84:8	201:5	167:1, 8	71:1 122:1	28:19 29:2
believe 7:10	206:21, 25	177:24	Brief 67:14	
8:15 17:18,	207:11	178:7, 11	97:17	
20 19:16	208:7	209:23	bring 27:23	
22:8 27:9	211:21	210:24	28:1 102:23	
29:21	212:5	212:11, 12,	broad	
32:12 37:4	220:17	19 224:16	240:9, 14	117:22
40:25	223:13, 15		biweekly	118:25
			171:4	

197:22	21 21:16, 20,	133:8, 17	cancers	10 16:5
207:1 240:6	23 22:4, 10,	134:5, 9	206:12	70:12, 13, 19
broader	12, 25 23:6	136:17	208:4, 10	77:23
73:8	24:1, 13, 23	154:2	222:2, 6, 8	90:22
broke 10:24	25:6 32:3,	161:18	225:5, 11	126:9
brought	13, 15, 24	162:10	226:12	156:4
27:24 44:20	33:11, 12, 16	173:16, 21	caps 95:25	174:16
bulk 14:1	34:2 35:9	174:2	Caption	249:1
64:9 198:1	36:24 37:6,	179:8	249:1	Case-
bunch 46:9	13 38:4	181:19	captioned	Control
106:18	39:11	195:9	72:18 249:8	5:17 92:17,
	40:13	196:4, 13	captured	21 93:2
< C >	41:12, 16	197:3, 9, 11	72:14, 16, 17	147:9
C.P 115:25	42:10 43:2	198:2, 19, 25	190:16	148:19
	50:3, 14	199:13	192:8	173:17, 22
CABARRUS	54:19, 21, 23	202:24	carcinogen	209:22
252:2	55:2, 5	206:9, 17, 22	107:24	210:3, 7, 9,
calculated	56:6, 21, 23	207:12, 18,	205:24	13, 18, 25
221:22, 25	57:22 58:3,	19, 22, 24, 25	216:9	211:4
223:21	12 59:9, 24	208:9, 17	carcinogenesi	cases 9:9
call 46:15	60:8 61:4,	209:4, 12, 17	s 206:4	11:11 62:2,
128:25	25 62:1	210:20, 22	213:11	7 64:2, 4, 5,
174:19	74:17 82:4	211:11, 15	carcinogenic	6, 8, 9 70:20
called 18:22	83:5, 10	214:22	206:18	71:6
35:3	85:24	215:20	208:13	129:21
102:19	86:17 87:9	216:5	carcinoma	154:2
112:14	90:13, 19	221:17, 20,	56:4, 18	223:12
119:15	94:3 95:2,	21, 24	91:3 198:9	cases/control
204:1	8 102:9	222:18, 25	226:7	s 128:16
Canada	106:22	223:13	carcinomas	cast 105:5
26:20	107:2, 9, 16	225:20	225:22, 24	192:13
99:10	108:4, 17, 24	226:6, 16	career	193:10
195:13	113:3, 17	227:2, 20	14:21 16:7	casts 191:23
196:1	115:11, 19	228:3, 18, 20,	20:18 21:14	catch
236:22	116:2, 24	24 229:2	careers	157:17
237:1, 16	117:10	230:15, 23	222:18	categories
238:10, 15,	119:23	231:11, 18	carefully	77:22 85:7
16, 19 240:9	120:4, 16, 20	232:5, 7, 17	229:15	138:9
Cancer	123:24	236:10, 20	Carolina	139:14
4:11, 13, 18,	124:1, 2, 4, 8,	238:1	2:6, 7	140:14, 17
22 5:2, 4, 9,	15, 17 125:1	240:21	32:22	141:15
12, 16, 20	126:3, 19	241:3	33:10 252:1	143:4
7:20 19:8,	130:24	246:7	case 11:21,	158:3, 5
12, 22 20:2,	131:4, 11, 19	247:22	23, 25 12:6,	166:21, 22

168:10	207:12	certainty	CINDY 2:4	217:13
173:9	223:13	96:17	252:4, 24	229:23
175:3 191:5	causes 7:19	97:12, 19	cited 20:10	230:6, 8, 25
categorizatio n 62:4	33:15 34:1	98:25	45:1	clearly 16:2
categorizatio ns 117:22	35:9 36:23	CERTIFICA	194:25	85:6 145:3
118:25	37:12 38:3	TE 252:3	233:9	cleavage
159:13	39:10	Certified	235:14	106:7, 10, 11, 16
168:19	40:13 41:5,	2:5	citing 89:6	close 12:25
169:9	16 42:9	certify	Civil 2:4	74:15
categorized	43:2	252:5, 15	claim 58:5	233:22
168:22	202:24	challenging	clarification	coach 42:17, 18
category	208:17	214:25	74:3	coaching
70:25 71:3	240:21	change	109:21	co-author
155:10, 13	CDC 31:5,	73:11 74:9	200:24	19:11, 14
164:10	16, 22 32:1,	154:6	clarify 11:1,	20:25
causal	12, 17, 22	194:16	4	104:3
196:11	cell 54:25	250:4, 7, 10,	class 43:22	131:14
197:1, 16	55:5 56:3,	13, 16, 19, 22	classify	212:6
213:8, 14	18 57:1	251:4, 7, 10,	96:14	co-authors
214:19	63:2 91:2,	13, 16, 19, 22	classifying	168:24
215:18	8, 11, 21	changed	69:24 193:1	171:4
216:7	198:9, 25	17:1 25:20	clean 153:7,	Cochrane
237:18	199:8, 11	26:5 154:6	10	147:23
238:5	cellular	158:9	clear 23:3,	cohort 59:4,
246:25	167:10	249:11, 14	20 24:16	5, 19, 20
cause 40:20,	197:7 227:3	Chapel 2:6	42:21	64:3, 6, 8, 15,
22 55:5	certainly	characteristi	22 65:5, 8	22 65:5, 8
56:3, 18, 20	19:5 21:1	c 129:1, 5	70:1 72:25	70:1 72:25
102:9	37:4 54:21	characterize	57:1 63:2	89:5, 19
106:21	55:14	239:19, 20	91:2, 8, 11,	132:11, 24
107:2, 8, 15	67:22	characterize	21 113:9	133:9, 14, 19
108:4, 16	88:13	d 75:21	118:4, 22	192:8
126:2	109:10	226:24	139:1	210:4 245:2
227:19	136:10	239:22	152:15	cohorts
228:3	175:5	choose	183:2	131:5
231:18	184:9	170:5	198:9, 24	193:19
236:10, 20	187:3	chose	199:8, 11	coin 192:25
237:25	191:14	165:19	200:14	Colette
241:3	198:5	CHRISTOP	208:2	19:11
252:10	201:25	HER 3:8	213:7	colleagues
caused	224:7		214:8	123:4, 6
206:22	232:22			

collected	common	completed	241:2	confident
130:13	41:9 68:10, 19, 23 78:21	224:23	248:14	50:23
133:16	140:16	completely	concludes	confirm
169:7	202:12	30:19	38:3	81:23
collection	commonly	148:22	concluding	confirmed
46:17 58:23	96:5 181:21	192:10	237:25	62:2, 7
collective	communicate	216:10	conclusion	confirms
27:7	d 17:22	comport	26:22	conflict
column	Community	174:23	36:23 37:4,	88:2, 6
83:25	16:25 17:1	concern	12 85:21	98:7, 9, 12
128:13	206:21, 24	71:24	86:6	246:3
164:4, 9	207:11, 16	132:12, 15, 17, 25 145:9	197:17	247:25
combination	226:6	178:3, 4, 14, 17	212:16	248:3, 4, 8
60:17 112:8	company	concerned	218:20	conflicts
combine	111:24	189:14	235:19, 20	47:21 52:6,
169:25	compare	235:12	236:23	9, 23 88:14
combined	99:13	concerning	conclusions	123:17
45:18	135:17	19:8 48:19	44:12	212:18, 19,
137:12	148:3	136:13	235:13, 17	22 247:17
combining	compared	252:9	conducted	confounders
96:6 193:19	28:14 65:9	concerns	44:5 64:11	146:19
come	95:14	47:25	conference	confounding
13:3	181:19	49:22, 23	58:24	146:16, 18
17:16	comparing	105:6	67:15	213:12
40:22	85:19	130:9	163:21	conjunction
125:14	178:23	132:20	171:11	112:17
146:11	179:20	188:5	228:13	connection
160:25	180:4	comparison	confidence	103:24
192:12	180:4	209:22	62:10 63:3,	113:9
195:5, 7	compatible	conciliatory	7 65:25	connote
207:5	125:11, 18	37:18	67:11 68:5,	148:12
233:14	130:12	conclude	20 75:16	connotes
coming	compensatio	39:10 55:4	76:16 77:9,	148:14
137:14	n 113:2, 16	56:3, 17	13, 15, 17	consensus
comment	complained	100:12	85:16, 18	208:8, 12
64:18 89:2	30:2	213:13	91:6 92:10	226:14, 19,
106:3	complete	246:24	94:5 99:1	24
commented	45:13, 25	concluded	117:2, 12	consider
130:22	195:16	107:14	125:3, 5, 9,	28:13
comments	18:13	236:9, 19	16 164:18	47:19
88:16	216:5	238:4	165:17	63:25 65:1
103:13, 25		240:21	187:3	74:11, 21
104:1				88:12 93:9
committee				

105:16	184:10	contribute	118:15	81:22
123:14, 19	234:15	contributed	120:9	92:24
144:10	Consortium	contributing	121:15	203:18
145:23	5:3 19:13	14:22	128:9, 12, 15	correlate
180:12	115:20	201:15	129:7	182:13
218:7	116:3	201:15	130:16	correspondence
considerable	169:5 171:9	control	148:10	104:4, 7
125:3, 24	consultant	29:24	150:5	cosmetic
194:16	48:11	40:23	152:6	196:12
considerably	246:6, 10	146:15, 19	158:14, 21	197:1
64:6	247:21	174:12	162:20	coughing
consideration	contact	controlled	165:3	67:6
63:17 64:2	43:19	146:18	166:11	Counsel 3:5,
105:9	contacted	controls	169:1	20 35:13
136:15	23:8 26:25	71:6 129:22	170:13	36:6 39:16
considered	27:3	controversy	172:9	101:24
7:9 21:1	contain	252:9	176:11, 20	111:5
31:16, 22	44:24	convenient	177:20	112:12
45:12, 15	102:9, 18	69:7	179:11, 12	204:9, 16
49:20	109:2	conversation	182:7, 14	233:12
52:16	contained	83:2 168:2,	183:21	247:16
54:14	102:11, 14	5 212:25	185:11	252:16, 17
63:23 65:4	106:25	conversely	186:1, 2, 9,	County
70:13	container	210:5	21 187:5, 11	5:12
90:24	202:1	convey	188:8, 14	161:19
102:4	containers	222:14	189:22, 23	162:11
103:5	101:21	conveys	190:5, 7	252:2
104:20	202:15	221:19	193:25	couple
108:11	contains	222:14	194:13, 21	16:10, 17
124:2, 5	7:15 102:3	copy 33:17	196:6	20:6 60:12
155:4	context	36:7 172:20	204:18	72:3
201:6	84:12, 16	Correct	212:9, 18	223:19
207:24	208:16	21:7 27:22	233:2	244:6
238:23	contingent	29:22	234:10	course
243:23	143:13	30:17	241:12, 13,	18:17, 21, 22
considering	continue	32:24	17 243:1, 5	19:4 21:13
64:3	73:6 75:7	41:19	247:2	41:2
218:19	80:8	42:10 60:4	corrected	147:20
240:11	contradiction	73:9 87:12,	69:5	166:18
consistent	28:12	14, 15 88:4	corrections	204:7
93:10, 23	contradictor	94:3 98:10	249:11	217:22
183:15	y 28:10	99:6	correctly	courses
		106:17	23:19	18:24
		116:25	72:22	

COURT	Critical	155:4	206:11	21 37:9, 16,
1:1 15:23	4:20 90:11,	Dan 131:13	221:8	19, 22 38:2,
16:5 23:16	17 181:1	Dana 76:22	225:4	6, 10, 13, 15,
80:22	criticism	Daniel	227:22	18, 21 39:1,
91:15	190:9	120:15, 16	232:12	6, 7, 19 40:2,
119:25	235:6, 15, 25	173:18	235:22, 24	9 41:13, 18,
235:1, 12, 21	criticisms	data 20:10	237:17	22 42:1, 5,
236:4, 5	190:7	33:11	datasets	15 43:3
240:19	244:21, 25	44:10, 11	143:14	44:4, 14, 19
courtesy	criticized	54:22 55:4	Date 4:16	46:4, 8, 12,
35:14	64:15 235:1	56:2, 16	25:9, 13, 16	18 47:1, 5, 9,
177:15	criticizing	72:23 75:2	27:17	15 48:22
COVID	241:6	86:2 96:6	69:11 228:6	49:25 50:8,
233:23	crosses 66:1	103:4, 10	dated 4:15,	22 51:23
Cramer	67:11	105:9	24 43:25	52:24
87:11, 16	CRR 2:5	115:6	69:11	53:15, 22
88:8	252:4	118:1	104:13, 18,	55:16, 20, 22,
120:15, 16,	ctisi@levinla	125:11, 18	20	24, 25 56:8,
24 121:14	w.com 3:10	128:11	DAVIDSON	10 57:2, 6,
122:20	cumulative	129:1, 6, 11,	3:17 4:3, 5	12 58:14, 20,
131:13	95:8	16, 20 130:4,	6:8 8:1, 5,	25 60:5, 22
173:14, 18	currently	8, 11, 16	25 9:12	61:11, 15
190:24	22:1	133:16	10:1, 18, 22	63:18
245:1	214:19	137:11	11:2, 5, 7, 15,	65:13, 18
Cramer's	215:18	139:2, 3	18, 22 12:1,	66:9, 17, 22
83:15	cut 138:1	147:1	3, 4, 16 13:1,	67:4 68:2
173:25	139:23	152:8, 13, 23	16, 19 14:13,	69:14
174:1	140:5, 23	153:22, 23	16 22:22	70:14
credibility	141:8, 18	155:16	23:24 24:8	73:20, 24
53:17	142:8, 20	156:12	25:3, 19, 23	74:4, 10
criteria	156:19	158:8	26:4, 15	76:7 79:10,
143:7, 23	169:22	159:3, 10, 19	27:18	16, 19, 22, 25
144:10, 15	170:19	166:8	28:25	80:3, 7, 13,
145:4, 8	243:11	168:15	29:10, 14, 19,	17, 24 81:1,
146:5, 8, 21,	CV 13:6	169:3, 5, 6, 7,	22 30:3, 5, 8,	5, 9, 10
22 148:22	18:6	11, 24, 25	11, 14, 17, 19,	82:18, 22, 24
154:23, 25	C-word	176:13	24 31:19, 25	83:7 84:13,
155:20, 21	41:8	177:5	32:11	19, 23 89:3
156:5, 16, 23		179:16	33:18, 21, 24	90:8, 15
161:10	< D >	183:15	34:4, 8, 11,	91:15 92:2,
166:4	D.C 3:4	195:17	14, 21 35:3,	14 93:24
243:11	daily	196:11, 25	6, 12, 15, 20,	94:21
	154:21	197:25	24 36:2, 8,	98:17
		198:5, 9, 16	11, 13, 15, 19,	101:4

103:23	14, 21 162:3	18 218:15	170:7	142:8
104:15	163:5, 6, 14,	219:7, 14, 17,	deal 23:13	144:14
107:6, 17	22 164:6, 11,	22 220:2, 4,	decade	145:13
108:7, 18	13 165:8	6, 10, 12, 14	175:8, 11	168:12
109:16, 22	166:6	221:11	decades	170:22
110:2, 11	167:18, 20	226:17	232:6, 9, 18	243:4
111:8, 10, 13,	170:20	227:1, 9, 17	decide	defined
16, 20	171:12, 21	228:11, 14	137:18	78:15
115:15, 22	173:24	229:5, 10, 19,	decision	138:3, 19, 21,
118:12, 20	175:10, 17,	24 230:3, 8	20:19	22 139:7, 25
119:1, 8, 21	24 176:3, 7,	231:8	26:17	140:2
120:7	8 177:1, 7,	232:1, 15, 25	139:20	141:7
126:17	13, 16	234:25	144:4	144:6
127:7, 12, 16,	178:18	236:12, 25	145:13, 18	167:24
20 128:23	180:19	237:3, 9, 19	159:2	168:24
129:10	181:2, 7, 11	239:3, 10, 13,	169:10	242:24
130:19	182:20, 25	17, 22	170:22	defines
132:14	184:16	240:18	171:5 235:8	170:12
133:24	185:5, 20	242:3, 9	decisions	defining
134:12	186:17	244:1	137:23	139:1
135:11	187:22	245:10, 13,	145:2, 10	141:13
136:4, 23	188:1	19, 23	235:10	168:17
137:17	189:5, 9, 13	246:12, 18	DECLARAT	definitely
138:16	191:10	247:4	ION 249:3	9:25
139:17	192:11	Davis 19:11	declare	definition
140:8, 18	194:5, 19	21:6 33:3	249:6	73:8
141:25	196:16, 19	37:10, 11	decrease	109:20
142:17, 23	197:13, 19	38:3, 23	76:3, 5	165:2
143:11, 20	198:7, 21	39:8 105:8	deem 96:21	168:7, 14
144:17	199:9, 21	112:14	Defendant	169:2
145:6	200:6, 21	113:8	3:20 238:25	242:18
149:17	201:8	115:8, 16, 25	defendants	243:21, 23
150:10	202:16	117:6, 20	239:1	degree 95:9
151:11	204:15, 22	119:12	defendant's	190:8, 11, 12
152:11	205:9	167:15	7:21	delineated
153:1, 8, 11,	206:8	168:6, 12	defended	139:22
15, 25	207:2, 7, 20	170:4, 12	18:15	demonstrabl
154:20	208:14, 19	243:4	defense	e 85:21
156:9	209:2, 6, 8,	day 2:7	48:1	86:15 87:6
157:5, 18	19 211:6, 13	239:19	101:24	demonstrate
158:7, 20	214:17	249:17	121:10	79:6 87:6
159:15	215:2, 9, 12,	252:21	define	demonstrate
160:3, 12, 16,	13, 16, 22, 24	days 60:13	107:4	d 71:17, 21
19 161:2, 7,	217:4, 6, 10,		137:18, 22	

demonstrativ	75:18	detail	37:24	dichotomize	differently
e 13:21	76:14 88:5	133:12	93:15	42:20	
Department	98:24	171:6	dichotomous	68:25	
16:25 17:2	110:9	detailed	71:7, 9	138:4	
19:1	122:8	181:23	dichotomy	139:8, 25	
	137:21	details	67:23	167:25	
departmental	140:21	9 169:21	differ	168:25	
17:5	143:24	174:4	157:13, 22	170:8, 12	
dependent	158:16	191:7	differed	175:1 243:5	
214:5	210:9	223:17	129:20	differs	
depending	214:14	224:1	difference	178:1, 10	
241:25	described	detect	86:23	difficult	
deposed	41:10	determinatio	121:24	146:14	
6:16 12:6,	52:19	ns	129:23	213:12	
10 27:8	109:9	determine	147:8	246:24	
45:20, 24	152:14	102:12	differences	difficulty	
DEPOSITIO	165:21	206:17	85:15 227:7	199:6	
N 1:11 2:1	221:9 235:9	develop	different	diffraction	
6:18 7:1, 6	describing	70:2, 11	69:25 70:1,	100:4, 6	
9:11 15:18	110:6	development	10 75:20	direct	
29:1, 21	185:9	59:9 91:2	78:18 99:3	150:21	
34:5 55:10,	186:15, 25	95:2	108:7	direction	
12 89:5	188:4, 12	108:24	114:6, 7	252:12	
109:15	193:18	115:10	130:9	directly	
110:25	DESCRIPTI	116:24	133:11	21:2 183:23	
111:23	ON 4:10	199:12	139:24	disagree	
205:6	28:7	207:24	140:5	22:12	
208:23	143:25	208:4	141:8	26:16 27:4	
219:15, 18,	183:3	228:17	142:8, 20	56:13	
21 221:1, 5	design	229:2	144:3	86:18	
229:8	210:3, 21	230:14	148:23	96:25	
232:3	designed	deviation	149:3	138:24	
248:13	133:8	173:9	150:4, 14	145:1, 15	
249:1, 8, 12	210:10	devoted	164:24	211:2, 5	
250:1	desirable	222:18	169:5, 8, 19,	214:23	
251:1	63:24 65:4	diagnosed	24 174:15	215:25	
252:12	195:17	57:23	178:24	216:4, 10	
depositions	198:5	131:4, 11, 19	186:18	221:18, 19	
6:17	despite	diagnoses	222:11	224:18	
depot 30:22	20:12 64:7	179:9	225:11	225:7	
deps@golko	93:10	232:6, 7, 8	234:2, 3	disagreed	
w.com 1:20	242:14	diagnosis	243:22	16:3 22:9	
describe	detached	133:17	differential	235:18, 19,	
40:17	171:25		71:5	20	

disagreeing	231:22	Document	52:25	dropped
178:15	234:4	4:11 25:5	53:23 54:4	232:8
disclose	discusses	27:23	66:23	Drs 87:11
88:2, 5, 7	83:15	30:16	83:15	214:18
112:16, 21, 25	discussing	39:24	87:12, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24	246:19
disclosed	63:21	240:23	88:8, 9	drug 48:10
112:18	111:2	documents	120:8, 24	due 229:23
disclosure	130:25	7:7, 18	121:14	Duke 13:6
98:8 113:8, 20 115:3	139:7	47:14	14:8, 18, 20	14:8, 18, 20
121:12	discussion	110:24	122:20	16:23 17:6
246:4	62:15, 18	111:1, 4, 7, 24 216:18	135:22, 23	22:14, 24
disclosures	103:7	doing 18:10	136:5, 6	23:1, 4, 8
113:23	170:10, 18	41:3 96:5	161:8	24:11
114:7	171:10	123:12	173:14, 25	32:22
246:8	179:1	141:22	174:1	233:22
247:17, 23	181:15	145:20	189:16	duly 6:4
discontinued	185:15	dose 118:3	195:19	252:7
72:12	213:17	dose-	213:2	duration
discount	224:12, 16	response	222:17	105:10, 14
48:21	disease 41:5	117:20, 24	233:2, 8, 12	117:23
70:2 76:12	70:2 76:12	118:5, 14, 24	244:7, 8, 9,	118:2, 5, 14,
discuss	diseases	195:15	17, 18, 21, 22,	24 162:19
80:18	210:10	double-	24, 25 245:9,	166:8, 15
83:16	disregard	check 190:4	246:2, 4, 5, 9	dying 221:3
87:14	48:13	223:14	247:10, 12,	< E >
97:24, 25	dissertation	doubled	20, 25	earlier
224:5	18:13	193:23	draft 99:10,	33:11 90:2
discussed	41:2	194:10	17	93:13
40:25	distinct	doubt 53:16	drafted	112:2, 3
85:10	225:5, 10	191:23	114:20	drive 52:21
87:10 91:9, 18 123:7, 16	distinction	193:10, 21	167:23	driven
130:1	157:1	194:9	172:24	doubts
150:11	DISTRICT	douche	166:19	176:9
168:17	1:1, 2	192:13	169:11	197:6
171:5	DMPA	183:21	drives	198:14
189:10	30:22	Douching	123:19, 20	212:8
194:15	doctor	5:12	Dropbox	216:17
211:19	120:17	171:17, 22	45:25 46:3,	229:4
212:8	244:6	183:5, 11, 12	17, 21, 22	246:21
216:17	doctoral	184:7 187:6	drives	early 177:3
218:14	53:6	Dr 5:22	47:10	229:7
219:19		6:9 40:10	Dropboxes	233:23

earned	8:12	24:11	epidemiologi	ESQ
13:8, 25		68:11	c	3:2, 3, 8, 13, 17
easier	13:22	101:10	endometrioid	essentially
96:16		117:22	63:2 225:23	43:19
easy	6:21	118:5, 14	endometriosi	establish
139:2		122:3	5:5	89:13
EBP	19:3	149:7	119:24	established
ectopic		165:20	120:5	155:20, 22
225:25		240:12	124:9, 13, 17, 21, 24 125:2	207:17
edition		241:6	126:2, 14, 19	estimate
76:23		Eleanor	128:17	9:25 67:18
editor	50:2,	248:9	engrossed	74:23 75:1
7, 13 51:1, 3,		electron	83:1	91:5 93:17
11, 18 87:11		100:23	enrolled	94:14
233:2, 8		101:1, 2	72:7, 13	95:13 99:2, 3 124:22
241:9		elevated	132:11	125:7, 9, 14, 15 245:6
244:17		117:3	enrollment	estimates
247:1, 12		eliminate	72:25 73:3	93:6, 7, 19
248:4, 7		222:5, 6	179:25	177:25
editorial		eliminating	180:1, 5	et
76:19, 22		222:8	181:21, 22	119:17
82:19 83:8,		email	182:4	134:2 162:9
13, 16 88:10,		17:22	183:6, 12	eTable
19 244:9		e-mails	116:1	5:17
editors		17:4	184:1, 6	183:20
113:6, 18, 21		emerita	185:10, 17	185:7, 22
educational		16:24	186:13, 14	186:20
202:25		Emi	189:25	187:10
173:10		201:10	190:15, 16	188:7, 20
effect	71:2,	205:14	192:7	189:6, 8, 15
17 91:5		E-M-I	entire	ethnicity
95:13 99:2,		201:12	117:10	173:10
4 113:15		emphasize	207:15	etiologically
115:6		19:6	226:15	225:5, 10
177:25		employed	249:7	European
Effects	5:4	252:17	entirely	89:18
119:22		employees	152:15	evaluate
120:3 209:1		172:14	entitled	8:7 88:16
Egilman		Emu	83:8 90:17	114:22
233:2, 8, 12		201:5, 9, 12	162:19	136:11
eight-hour		enabled	environment	203:12
55:11		170:4	231:10	evaluating
either	10:21	endometrial	epi	63:17 65:5
22:14, 19, 23		225:25	71:21	96:3 152:21
23:4, 5			96:14	especially
				177:25

evaluation	232:24	exhaustively		16:2 51:7
52:12	234:22	55:11		52:2 87:17
123:20	EXAMINAT	142:12		98:2
240:16	ION 4:3, 4,	205:6 219:4	experimental	101:19
evaluators	5, 6 6:7	EXHIBIT	experiments	123:1
148:23	244:4	4:11, 13, 16,	Expert 4:13,	172:4, 11
event	245:18	20, 23 5:1, 4,	23 46:20	220:17
174:22	247:8	6, 9, 12, 16,	48:2 50:4,	238:20
Everybody	252:11	17, 22 25:4,	15 51:3, 10,	241:12
217:2	examine	5 26:2, 7	19, 24 69:10,	244:11, 13
Evidence	243:15	58:9, 10	16 87:20	expert's
4:19 5:21	examined	69:4, 6, 9, 15	88:1, 20	218:24
8:7, 10	6:4 109:14	82:20, 25	97:10 98:6	220:21
27:21 28:9,	111:17	83:3, 8	101:24	explain
13 29:5	208:24	90:9, 10, 16	104:12, 17	49:23
56:20 83:5,	219:4	104:10, 11,	112:17	69:21
10 96:4, 7,	221:1	16 115:16,	113:13	71:15
18 97:7, 11,	252:11	17, 24	114:18	138:1
12, 20	Examining	119:10, 20,	117:5	202:22
150:13	4:18 83:5,	25 120:3	120:24	235:19
151:3	10	127:9, 13, 16,	121:3, 10, 15	explained
198:1	example	17 130:22	123:14	114:20
211:12, 16	41:11	134:1, 7	134:23, 25	151:8
Evidence-	54:25	153:2, 8, 16,	135:1, 4	explaining
Based	65:12	17 161:15,	136:10	71:14, 20
18:22, 23	69:24	17 162:6	193:14	explanation
19:2	105:2	167:17, 19	218:9, 12	30:13
exact 15:7	195:5, 7	171:16, 17,	234:1	explicit
18:18	206:2	22 173:14,	236:3	113:19
27:17 37:3,	225:18	19, 20 181:8	237:24	explicitly
6 217:16	examples	189:7, 10, 12	238:4, 24, 25	234:2 235:9
218:6	72:3	211:7, 9, 14	239:6	exposed
234:24	exception	242:12, 13	240:4	71:3 77:19,
exactly	184:11	245:11, 13,	241:6 246:3	21 78:13
68:18 89:9,	excluded	14, 21	expertise	85:7
25 131:14	15:24 16:2	247:11	103:11	Exposure
150:7	130:24	248:8	106:14	5:15 59:8
177:6	excluding	exists 50:24	109:10	60:17
187:2	20:5	expect	110:22	69:24
196:17	exclusion	71:14	203:17, 23	70:10 71:9,
197:20	144:23	159:12	204:23	24 72:1, 2
212:7	Excuse	experiment	205:13	73:8 76:12
224:20	139:9	125:13	experts	77:23, 24

78:2, 6, 23, 24 85:11 95:9 97:4 105:4 107:8, 14, 19, 21 108:3, 12, 16, 23 138:21 155:3, 7, 10, 24 156:3 170:3 171:19, 24 177:20 192:19 193:1, 9 195:20 202:7, 20, 21 214:7 227:22, 23 228:20 229:1, 9, 11, 12 230:14, 22 235:4 243:16, 20 exposures 133:13 227:3 242:19, 22 express 22:11 expressed 56:25 expressing 123:9 extent 20:23 109:14 132:25 extra 98:16 extreme 132:23 193:8 extremely 210:13	eyes 163:15 164:12 214:25 223:17 eyesight 163:23 <F> fact 55:20 64:21 68:22 85:14 87:2 93:10 97:10, 18 114:17 133:16 136:5 166:8 172:7 202:7 208:23 234:8 factor 21:23 23:10, 25 24:13 26:22 28:22 29:3, 4 32:13, 15, 23 52:15 65:4 78:5 123:14, 23 124:2, 5 126:2 213:8 Factors 4:11 5:4 21:16 22:10, 25 23:6 24:22 25:6, 25 26:14 28:14, 19 29:5, 9, 11, 16 30:6	32:2 41:4 55:12 119:22 120:4 133:11 205:22 214:20 215:18 216:5, 7 222:4 223:3, 6 225:15 227:3 fair 33:23 63:5 99:20 100:12 132:1 137:15 139:2 143:16 235:6, 14, 25 236:1 fall 67:23 fallen 232:6, 18 fallopian 151:16 153:24 154:18 206:13 225:23 226:8, 13 familiar 24:17 31:5 53:23 54:8, 10 100:21 106:6, 9 108:2, 19 112:13 120:8, 11 134:13 139:5 161:22	203:25 204:3 Family 16:25 123:23 124:1, 3, 4, 8, 14, 21, 25 FAQ 21:19 22:3 far 8:12 80:6 102:11 129:5 174:25 222:20 228:5 Faries 10:4 43:7, 12 F-A-R-I-E-S 43:8 fast 24:5 fax 1:19 FDA 201:16, 20 216:20, 21, 22 217:25 219:14, 17 FDA's 218:24 220:20 February 1:15 2:7 26:6, 10, 11 228:15 252:6, 21 Federal 2:3 9:9 15:23 fee 122:4 feel 32:25 50:25 51:2 felt 235:21 Ferraro 121:3	fewer 47:25 70:20 fibrous 108:20, 23 109:2, 6, 20, 23 110:9 field 20:13 203:21 figure 179:10 186:1 final 99:13 114:2 finally 204:5 financially 252:18 find 27:1 47:1 59:22 62:22 77:8 86:9 103:7 104:23 115:8 117:6, 20 118:23 167:21 178:25 201:24 216:21, 22 217:15 220:5 221:4 finding 118:13 201:17 218:4, 24 220:20 findings 48:13, 17, 18, 21 65:24 67:10, 17 93:22 96:21 195:1 finds 97:11 fine 24:9 29:25
--	---	--	---	--

142:5, 6	five	138:12	179:11	226:9	frame
196:3		160:25	180:7	232:10, 19	167:11
fingers		169:5	186:13, 15	234:21	framework
224:11	fix	94:22	219:8, 24	236:11, 21	95:24 96:3,
finish 6:19	FL	3:9	food 20:11	238:21	9, 13, 15
23:16	Fletcher		Footnote	240:5	freely 122:9
63:15		201:4	98:18, 20	forming	frequencies
79:11 80:4		202:25	151:18, 19	103:6	155:8
116:13		203:13	forgo 6:18	forth	frequency
166:1		204:25	forgot 67:4	157:13, 23	60:18
182:19, 22		205:14	83:1	forum 20:1	105:10, 14
185:13		213:2	forgotten	forward	117:22
202:4	flip	192:25	150:11	205:7	118:2, 6, 14,
237:8, 12	FLOM	3:15	168:6	found 37:5	24 138:8
finished	focused		form 28:20	62:25	139:16
23:22		16:16	29:7 44:7,	74:16	140:5, 13
61:14		56:22	18 52:13	91:10, 19	141:15
75:11 160:9		103:9 137:7	93:12	92:16	142:2
firm 10:5	focusing		94:18	97:19	143:4
121:3, 4		228:21	128:19	112:5, 9	145:13
firms 113:2	follow		129:8	125:20	158:5
first 6:4		43:21	130:12	126:13	162:19
19:11 33:8		174:16	132:4	136:12	166:7, 14
43:16, 25		175:16	135:25	179:7	167:2, 13
82:15	following		138:5	193:24	168:10, 19
90:19		31:21 42:6	139:10	194:11, 15	169:20
92:20		56:14 61:1	144:16, 19	201:21	178:20
112:23, 24		67:8 91:17	149:5	216:8, 12, 19,	179:1
115:3, 25		145:19	150:6	20 217:21	Frequent
120:2, 18		157:19	151:2	218:21	5:8 62:8
136:23		175:14	152:10	219:1	134:3, 8
167:21		194:7	154:12	220:23	136:18
173:8, 12		196:23	155:18	223:12	137:3, 4, 7,
174:2, 6, 14		205:11	165:4	234:5	19 138:3, 14,
212:5		207:9	176:21	four 55:16,	18, 21, 25
first-degree		220:18	178:12	21 193:19	139:8, 13, 18,
124:8, 14, 16,		230:11	180:16	fourth	19 140:16,
25 126:3		236:16	191:2	84:14	19, 23 141:7,
first-year		240:1	197:23	181:23	14, 19 142:8,
19:2	follows	6:5	204:11	fragment	19 143:6
fit 235:22,	follow-up		207:3	106:7, 10, 11	144:6
24		64:17, 22	208:6, 18	fragments	145:16
		65:1, 3, 7, 11,	214:11	106:16	151:13
		16, 22	218:10		155:4

156:2	further	116:1, 23	210:23	goes 91:6
158:17	30:12 34:6	117:16	215:4	164:18
159:20	35:21	128:6	given 49:24	going 6:18,
165:22	214:4	167:24	83:24, 25	23 11:6
167:24	215:1	168:8, 12, 20,	193:8	14:10 24:1
168:3, 7, 12, 20, 25	218:14	25 170:22	213:7	25:17
170:12, 22	245:8	171:18, 22	221:16	29:14, 24
242:18, 23	247:5	174:7	252:13	37:14 38:5
243:5, 22, 24	248:11	179:21	gives 86:20	39:12
frequently	252:15	181:18	125:10	43:20 48:6
60:14	< G >	183:21	146:6	55:8, 19, 20
117:17	general	186:11	giving 211:3	58:9 70:4
139:22	37:25 65:3	190:18	glasses	82:19
143:10	108:9	205:23	98:16 215:5	102:22
159:6	122:17	214:21	go 6:23	109:13
167:5	123:11	215:20	9:1 27:1	114:13
178:9	133:10, 11	121:4	37:17	116:5
226:11, 23	207:23	getting	39:18	119:9, 24
front 30:18	208:8, 12	44:15 46:7	123:8	
161:8	226:5	68:22	70:2, 11	137:24
167:22	generally	100:3	75:5 77:11	152:24
247:14	20:16 31:9,	109:7	84:25	153:1, 5, 15
full 6:9	12, 15, 24	122:1	89:10, 15	160:10
23:17 52:1	41:9 44:10	137:16	116:20	161:11
82:2, 7, 8	63:24	162:4	119:1, 9	162:6
101:12	69:20	164:11	122:17	178:11
115:23	110:10	168:9 217:2	128:5	181:9
181:19	122:16	give 24:2	130:21	187:9
fully 200:1	133:5	34:5 35:2,	143:24	196:18
fulsome	138:6	16, 17 36:10	160:4	210:16
195:10, 21	144:18	39:17, 23	162:18	215:4
fun 164:12	147:7	48:23 49:5	164:25	219:3, 11
funded	206:21	50:21	165:22	227:10
48:10 49:3	207:11	65:24 67:9	167:15, 22	gold 167:4
122:7	228:20	72:3 84:9	173:4	GOLKOW
210:19	Genital	88:8	181:23	1:19
funding	4:13, 18	140:14	182:3	GOLOMB
48:8 88:7	5:1, 12	146:6	3:10, 13	
121:5	58:11	148:9	205:7	Gonzalez
122:7	59:14 83:4,	158:25	228:11	72:18 73:1,
210:19	9 85:23	170:16	239:17, 25	9 74:6
funny 221:2, 3, 4	86:17 87:8	191:20	242:3, 12	105:4, 6
	115:17		246:12	189:20
				190:7, 10

191:23	greater	Gynecologic	Harper	64:7, 9
192:13, 18,	63:1 74:13	5:17 211:9,	102:20, 21	65:14, 15, 19,
19, 20, 24	93:7, 20	24 212:25	103:13	21 99:10
193:5, 11, 22	95:21		203:13	132:9, 22
194:9	156:25	< H >	204:5, 10, 17	147:2, 5
good 32:16	159:11	half 59:13	213:2	195:13
51:8 52:16	162:22	192:21	HAYDEN	196:1
63:13	163:16, 25	Halfway	2:4 252:4,	214:5
100:5	165:10, 11	83:23 84:2	24	222:12, 18
146:14	168:13, 23	hallmark	hazard 59:8,	236:22
147:11	242:24	207:24	10, 15 62:7,	237:1, 16
148:14	243:19	hallmarks	23 63:6	238:9, 15, 19
174:18	Gripka	207:18, 21	67:18	240:8
175:8	6:11, 13	hand 36:12	73:11, 13	hear 57:9
198:4, 8	G-R-I-P-K-	210:14	74:6 85:15,	196:21
210:3, 4	A 6:13	252:21	17 92:9	237:14
213:9	ground	happened	95:18	heard 52:25
Gossett	235:2	70:7	125:21	92:1 98:5
76:19, 21, 22	group	183:13	154:13	108:21
82:19	17:19 85:6	219:14, 17	157:7	134:20
87:23, 24	87:4	happy	159:17	172:14, 18
88:10	173:11	39:15	head 20:8	204:2
Gotcha 47:3	207:25	58:19	50:11	heavily
government	groups	223:19	54:12 68:8	233:23
172:14	77:20	hard 71:14	158:4	234:6
GRADE	78:12 85:5	149:13	195:5	helped
95:24 96:8,	86:23, 25	163:15	196:5, 7	192:9
13, 15	110:17	191:8	199:7, 14	helpful
G-R-A-D-E	guess 9:19	223:18	209:14	29:12
95:25	67:2	Hardy 27:9	217:17	187:24
grades 49:7,	110:25	Harlow	heading	213:24
9, 10	234:18	87:12, 17	168:21	helps 192:14
gradient/dose	guessed	244:8, 17, 22,	183:22	hereinbefore
-response	23:18	25 245:24	184:2	252:6
195:11, 22	guidance	246:2, 4, 5, 9	185:23	hereof
grading	73:23	247:12, 20,	186:20	249:13
114:19	guided	25	188:13, 19	hereto
136:8	168:15	Harlow's	headings	252:18, 20
grant 121:5	Guthrie	5:22 88:9	183:14	Hernan
grants 16:7,	11:14 12:8	245:11, 14	189:15	41:1
8	guys 27:10	harmonize	Health 17:1	heterogeneity
great 171:6	33:15	151:22	20:21 21:1,	85:19
172:23		152:5	3 26:20	
194:24		169:6, 12, 24	31:17, 23	

HHS 114:2, 13 122:9	history	idea 11:21	143:22	199:8
high 95:9	123:23	146:6	193:4, 14	205:22
103:4	124:1, 4, 8, 14, 17, 21, 24,	ideally	210:6 228:1	243:12
149:20	25 126:3, 14	60:15	217:22	inclusion
150:1	213:4	210:10	inability	88:20
200:4	histotype	identification	213:7, 11	143:7, 23
201:3	62:4, 5	25:7 58:13	inadequate	144:9, 14, 23
203:3, 9, 12	histotypes	69:13 83:6	27:21	145:4, 8
higher 78:7	62:19	90:14	inappropriate	inclusion/excl
94:8, 14	Hold 180:24	104:14	e 209:20	usion
95:3	holding	115:21	incidence	161:10
124:20	176:5	120:6	221:21	income
125:14	honestly	127:19	include	13:2, 8, 25
126:16	187:19	134:11	14:1, 2, 4, 5,	14:1, 2, 4, 5,
148:18	HONIK	153:18	6, 15, 25	6, 15, 25
190:2	3:10	161:20	inconsistency	inconsistenc
highest	hope 28:5	171:20	es 188:15,	17
129:6	165:11	173:23	62:14, 17	28:12
146:25	hoped	189:8	63:8 68:4	inconsistentl
155:10, 13	140:22	211:12	83:19	y 235:5
156:2	Hospital	245:16	88:25	increase
243:16, 19	22:24 23:5,	identify	129:15	74:20, 22
highest-	9 24:11, 12	30:7 41:5	143:8	75:19 76:3,
frequency	hot 60:13	91:1 99:22,	213:17	6 154:15
159:9	hour 15:12	24 110:19	included	221:16
high-grade	227:10	186:5	17:4 59:1	increased
225:22	hours 9:23	ignored	63:3 68:12	37:5 40:18
226:7, 13	12:14 15:9,	235:13, 16	73:7	41:10
highly 31:7,	10 196:15	ignoring	129:14	74:17
10, 13	HR 85:16	235:23	149:25	75:14, 23
high-quality	huge 130:8	II 64:7	151:16	76:11, 17
150:22	209:18	impact	155:22	87:3 91:1,
Hill 2:6	Huh 167:18	214:5	156:17	8 92:12
44:5, 13, 16	hundred	222:15, 16	157:3	93:5 94:6,
99:17	15:8, 10	implies	121:21	13 117:10
200:23			224:7, 9	120:20
histological	hysterectomy	importance	14:6 39:10	166:10
62:23	78:17, 22	222:12	48:7 89:24	179:10
historic		important	154:25	increases
177:23	< I >	8:7, 9	156:20	203:4
historical	IARC	48:12 64:2	93:5	
222:23, 25	107:13	93:5	165:6	

increasing	12, 16	Institute	114:24	investigator
95:7, 8	209:12, 17	210:20	136:14	144:3
independent	inflammator	instruct	interpretatio	149:12
236:8, 18	y 209:1	39:12	ns 123:22	investigators
237:23	information	instructing	interpreted	133:7
240:20	28:10 58:1,	36:2, 4	115:7	139:24
index	7 128:18	insufficient	interrupt	149:8
indicate	149:13	64:16	73:20	invoice 10:2
68:14	174:21	intact	229:13	13:10
76:16	193:9	151:16	interrupted	invoices
120:23	195:9, 21	intended	10:23	8:16, 24
121:6, 9	233:18	42:17	41:22 42:3	9:8, 17, 21
151:15	informative	intent	79:24	10:21
246:9	223:3, 9	243:19	interrupting	12:21
indicated	informed	intention	79:20	13:13, 21
7:18 37:5	109:4	243:18	interruption	involve
39:16	114:21, 25	interaction	67:14	209:11
249:12	115:5	86:3, 25	interval	involved
indicates	117:13	interest	62:10 66:1	15:3, 14, 17
76:4 176:13	infrequent	47:21 52:6,	67:11 68:5	28:16 43:9
indication	138:15, 24	10, 23 70:3	75:17	51:6
213:12	139:14	77:24, 25	76:16	112:19, 24
indicative	140:16, 20	88:3, 6, 14	77:13, 15	123:6
237:17	141:14	98:8, 9, 12	85:16, 18	159:19
indium	143:6	123:18	91:6 92:10	208:3, 9
20:11	Ingham	212:18, 19,	94:5 117:2	involvement
individual	10:10, 14, 17	23 246:4	164:18	88:3 123:13
22:20 58:1	11:9 12:8	247:18, 25	165:17	involves
150:16, 18	inhalation	248:3, 5, 8	intervals	121:7
166:21	227:19	interested	63:3, 7	involving
169:4, 12	228:17, 23	233:19	68:20 77:9,	50:13 51:6
196:13	231:18, 22	252:18	17 117:12	161:11
197:2	inhaling	internal	125:4, 6, 10,	issue
199:8, 15	228:3	110:23	16	126:21, 22
individually	initiation	216:18	intervening	205:4
157:10	173:6	218:23	179:8	issues 31:17,
	176:25	220:19	introduce	23 114:23
inflammation	Initiative	interpret	13:20	its 22:9
5:9 161:18	65:20, 22	139:2, 3	173:13	36:23
162:10	132:9, 23	222:3, 11	introduction	154:2
203:6	Inn 2:6	interpretatio	177:23	202:20
206:2, 22	instances	n 48:17	invasiveness	
207:12, 17,		49:5 52:20	62:3	< J >
23 208:3, 8,	235:18			

J&J	jessica.david son@skadde n.com 3:19 job 146:14 193:20 JOHNSON 1:5 249:1 Johnson's 7:15, 19, 22 58:5 101:16 216:22 217:20 218:1 journal 50:2, 13 54:11, 17 68:3, 9, 24 69:1 113:4, 5, 12, 18, 23 114:1 121:23 122:15, 18 203:25 212:1, 3 journals 68:7, 17 121:25 122:2, 11, 12, 14, 16 204:4, 17 judge 20:4, 13 39:15 40:1 81:7 203:23 judgment 54:7 206:6 210:1 July 231:9 <K> Kadry 90:19	Katie 17:10 211:17 244:16 keep 79:19 223:6 keeping 1:5 249:1 234:14 248:5 kept 222:4 22, 24 157:1 167:4 201:18 207:6 216:9 228:1 234:14 kindly 247:10 Kleiner 10:10, 11, 12, 16 11:8, 12, 16 knew 25:16 199:21 know 6:16 122:15, 18 13:5, 12 14:21 15:5, 8 17:10, 19 21:22 22:1, 7, 20 23:3 24:22 26:18, 23 27:16 28:5 29:16 33:13 34:21	35:25 36:13 37:7 45:6, 7 47:18 49:3, 11, 16 50:20 51:13, 15, 16, 21 52:1, 3, 18 53:13, 19, 20, 25 54:1, 5, 6 57:3, 13, 15, 21 58:2, 4 66:23, 25 22, 24 157:1 68:16, 18 70:10 75:10 76:15, 16 77:4 81:7 82:2 86:7 87:19, 24, 25 88:13 89:22 95:24 96:5 97:17 98:3 100:1, 8, 9, 11 101:18 102:12 103:1 105:1 109:6, 11, 17, 23, 24 110:9 114:10 117:14 121:14, 16 122:19 123:8 126:12 129:11, 21 132:19, 20 133:6 135:7, 12, 15, 22 136:1 137:22 138:9, 11, 12, 23 142:6, 7,	18 144:8 146:14, 17 147:4, 19 148:17, 20 149:6, 8, 15 151:4, 9 152:2, 3, 4, 17, 22 154:10 155:14 157:6, 11, 20 158:3, 5, 8 159:7, 10, 16 160:1, 8 166:18 167:5 168:9 169:21, 22, 23 170:11 172:9, 12, 16, 18 173:5 176:15 177:4 179:4 186:22 187:1, 2, 12, 13, 15, 25 190:17 191:7, 11, 15 192:9, 16 193:13 196:6 197:24 198:15 200:9, 12 201:3, 13, 18, 20, 22 202:12 203:19, 20, 21 204:4, 7, 8 205:4 206:1, 14 208:11 212:14
----------------	---	---	--	--

217:14, 15	language	letter	5:22	life	13:22	52:2	77:4
218:13	172:25	50:1, 12, 24		96:16	242:2	82:1, 3, 8	
219:10	large	51:10, 17		ligation		88:25	
221:20	63:13, 14	83:15		78:16		133:20, 21	
222:2, 20	133:4	189:15		176:10, 15,		161:9	
223:20, 25	209:16	241:6		18, 23		162:16	
224:8	largely	245:11, 15,		ligations		listed	7:8
225:18	6	20, 24		78:20		32:13	
226:10, 18,	larger	247:11		light	100:16,	89:12	
22, 25 227:7	63:9, 19, 23	248:7		18		111:11	
228:4, 6, 8	large-scale	letters	50:6,	likes	98:14	151:25	
231:1	228:22	25	51:2, 6	limit	55:8	155:8	157:7
232:5, 17	latency	87:10	88:9	limitation		listen	
233:4, 5, 11,	210:11	233:2, 6, 8,		105:15, 17,		229:15	
13, 17 238:9,	law	12	241:8, 10	23	132:8	lists	23:5
17 244:12	10:4	244:9, 10, 17		210:24		literature	
knowing	113:2	247:1	248:4	limitations		26:21	
88:13 136:9	121:3, 4	Leung		49:21		40:19, 24	
knowledge	lawyer	231:10		132:7, 21		41:6	47:17
12:22	16:20	43:6		L-E-U-N-G		50:19	
17:11 52:2	112:4			133:18		56:22	
123:2	lawyers	231:13		147:8		108:22, 25	
135:9	43:9, 14, 17,	level	103:4	148:15		139:6	
136:15	19	107:25		150:20, 23		141:7	
172:6	lay	108:12, 14,		193:20		195:9	
244:7 252:9	138:8	15	141:24	195:15		209:11, 16,	
known	145:3	146:8		210:1		226:11	
126:2	lead	170:25		limited	62:1	18	
knows	171:2, 3	156:2				230:19	
< L >	173:18	157:2				231:16	
labeled	212:15	173:10		lines	113:1	233:20, 24	
186:3, 10	228:17	193:9		linking		237:5, 23	
laboratory	leads	200:1, 4		108:23		238:3, 8, 16,	
192:18	209:12	201:2, 3		Lisa	231:10,	18	239:5
103:2	learned	202:10, 21		13		240:3, 17	
110:20	led	203:3, 9, 12		list	21:22	LITIGATIO	
200:2	170:10	243:16, 20,		22:9, 25		N	1:8, 19
203:2, 15, 24	left	24		24:22		7:12	8:12
lack	83:25	levels	107:1,	25:24		9:15, 22	
195:21	lend	5		LEVIN	26:13, 17	13:4	15:2,
ladies	174:11	LIABILITY		32:2, 7		6, 15	40:12
221:3	length	1:8	249:3	45:11, 17, 19		41:15	42:9
laid	148:24	library	17:6	46:5, 6, 7, 8,		43:1	48:25
144:25	lent	159:14	lies	13, 15, 16		51:25	53:1
166:4				47:2, 13		54:19	

55:21	57:7,	138:25	166:7, 20	128:4	119:4
14, 19	75:21	145:7, 22	167:12	136:25	LYONS 3:3
87:20	88:1,	176:17	168:11	143:9	<M>
3	98:2, 9	190:22	171:13	155:6, 12	M.T 119:17
103:14,	24	210:11	178:19	156:21	maiden 6:14
112:19		231:5	180:10, 22	173:7	main 6:18
113:4,	10, 13,	240:22	181:1	183:22	77:23 155:2
17	121:7	longer 65:1,	182:24	186:12	majority
122:23,	24	3, 7	183:4, 18	170:7	93:18, 20
123:1,	4	Longo	184:17	177:19	175:4
131:18		112:10	185:21	Los 5:12	225:22
134:24		long-term	210:7	161:19	making
135:1,	13, 19,	59:23 60:7,	223:5	162:11	26:19 89:8,
23	136:6	11 61:3	233:24	lose 207:6, 7	25 145:10,
147:13		191:15	242:15	lost 118:21	13, 18
172:5,	11	242:23	243:18, 19	lot 20:8	219:12
227:19		look 25:1	looked 13:6	125:17	Mandarino
228:16		26:1 29:14,	21:15, 25	128:10, 18	201:4
233:15		17 32:1	22:6, 23	133:10	202:25
234:19,	20	34:23	23:2 32:5,	195:23	204:25
236:4,	6, 9,	48:15 49:1,	6 61:18, 22	196:8	205:14
19	237:25	2 52:5	62:3, 6	lots 217:19	Manhattan
238:20		58:8 59:7	77:1 83:13	241:22	3:18
239:6		67:16, 17, 22	91:9, 18	love 199:22	manifest
240:4		71:22 76:2	111:23	96:18	225:6
246:3	249:3	79:8 81:23,	152:20, 22	low 97:12, 20	manner
little	13:9	24 93:6, 17,	155:15	98:25	37:18
58:23	71:1	25 98:7, 13,	167:7	114:25	164:25
99:1	115:6	18 114:21	190:1	121:15, 16,	manners
124:11		115:1	200:3	20	169:8
126:11		116:4, 10	201:3	lower 94:8	manuscript
167:23		124:6	203:2, 9, 11	95:13	99:9 114:3
175:1		127:21	229:1	125:15	mark 25:3
191:7	240:9	128:1, 24	230:13, 23	126:15	58:9 69:3,
lives	17:13	139:21	231:2, 5	6 82:20	6
78:18		140:22	232:12, 22	looking 154:11, 16	90:8 104:9
LLP	3:2, 15	141:3	35:8 41:4	115:15, 16	lunch
location		146:24	59:13 78:3	119:17, 24	133:25
62:3		148:7	92:6 95:5	121:3	153:1, 15
long	16:12,	152:18	96:7 97:22	luncheon	161:14, 15
21	22:5	157:10	116:9	171:15, 16	
58:4	71:4,	159:5, 8, 11	150:12		
5	99:19	163:7, 24	123:16, 21		
118:21		165:9	126:25		

181:7	matches	132:18, 22	measures	135:10
189:5	186:24	135:6	181:18	224:14, 15
211:7	188:10	147:15	203:5	226:23
245:10	matching	148:13	mechanism	233:4
marked	188:4	160:8	102:7	mentioning
25:6 58:12	material	168:14	126:23	89:22
69:12	92:5	173:8	202:23	merging
82:25 83:6	materials	175:2	206:3	45:13
90:14	7:9 45:12	178:5, 6	208:25	merited
104:13	46:19 47:2,	180:20	mechanisms	88:20
115:20	11 57:17	185:25	206:1	messes 6:22
120:5	104:5 112:5	186:24	median	met 6:25
127:18	math 71:11	187:13	65:16, 22	7:4, 5
134:11	174:18	188:3	medical	17:11, 20
153:4, 18	mathematica	191:6, 13	68:3 120:17	53:11, 24
161:19	lly 70:17	206:16, 25	medically	66:24
171:20	71:7, 18	216:2, 13	62:2, 6	120:13
173:23	matter	217:1, 3, 24	Medicine	134:15
189:3, 8	52:17	218:22	16:25	144:9
211:12	114:22	232:21	medroxyprog	156:5, 23
245:16, 20,	219:22	240:22	esterone	165:5
21	249:8	241:16, 21,	30:22	meta-
Markers	matters	23	meeting	analyses
5:9 161:17	252:9	meaning	53:25	146:3
162:9	MDL 1:6	100:2 122:9	meetings	147:20
Market 3:13	9:9, 13, 22	means 76:3	17:5 171:5	193:4
MARKETIN	10:10, 17	93:1 98:25	memory	Meta-
G 1:6	11:9 12:9	147:10	36:18, 20	analysis 5:9
249:3	43:9, 13, 17,	225:11	81:15, 23	89:23 96:6
marking	19, 25 45:16	meant	98:14	97:11, 19
69:15	MEAGHER	69:21	menopause	104:6
90:16	3:15	87:23	241:15, 17,	134:6, 10
104:16	mean 23:18	182:12	19, 22, 24	135:3, 13, 18
115:24	28:1 46:12,	201:9 207:3	mention	143:12, 17
127:12	24 50:18	measure	19:4 48:9	144:1, 13, 21
181:9 189:9	52:17	60:16	99:5 130:3	145:21
marks	56:24 77:5,	68:11 72:9,	135:8	147:17
153:6, 9	6 78:13	22 118:2, 3	136:3	151:14
mass 31:3	83:17	138:7 203:6	192:14	156:12
match	88:14		193:15, 22	159:18
186:16, 19	105:19	measurement	194:10	166:9
187:14	114:9	177:24	233:1 248:4	243:12, 25
188:7	118:10	192:20	mentioned	
222:24	122:13		29:1 98:5	

methodologic	midst	72:1 75:3	mixing	71:2, 4:8, 15, 23
106:4	158:23	97:4	17	6:3, 9, 11
	233:23	105:21, 22	model	213:9 25:5 40:10
methodology	Mills	193:10	moderate	58:10 69:9,
16:3, 4, 6	mind	245:2	234:9	10, 17 83:3
20:16	29:6, 16	misclassified	modifier	90:10
48:16 49:2,	30:6 66:5	192:20	137:3, 4	104:11, 12,
4 52:19	81:24, 25	misheard	Mohamed	17 115:17
114:24	91:13, 24	237:10	90:19	120:3, 8
123:22	100:14		moment	127:17
136:12, 13	160:7, 11	misreporting	52:10 84:9,	134:7
235:2	224:3	71:23 72:1	18, 20	153:17
metric	230:25	missed	131:12	161:8, 17
72:19	Mine	25:9	missing	158:25
165:1, 6	153:4, 6, 9, 14	128:8, 11, 18,	170:17	171:17
MICHELLE	mineral	21 129:2, 6,	231:6	173:20
3:2 6:20	101:19	12, 16, 20	242:14	189:7
10:8 11:5	110:7	130:5, 7, 8,	money	195:19
24:3 34:4	218:12	15	8:11	211:9
37:22 38:8,	minerals	Missouri	month	244:7
10 58:20	109:9	10:14 11:9	7:6	245:9, 14
80:24	Minerva	misspoke	138:11, 12	247:10
84:20	204:1, 6	13:9	162:23	249:22
94:23	minimum	misstate	163:20	250:24
98:13	108:14	164:1, 20, 22	165:10, 12	251:24
199:21	141:24	Misstates	monthly	move 12:12
215:5	144:7	205:18	34:23 43:4	82:6 90:7
219:9	157:2	88:21	168:13	111:22
229:13	243:23	141:20	171:4	189:1
242:11	minute	142:22	months	194:24
244:1	66:3, 11 124:12	151:3	72:6, 25	211:6
Michelle's	188:6	158:11	73:2	221:12
42:16 45:5	246:1, 13	170:14	179:25	movement
microscopy	minutes	191:25	180:1, 13, 14	205:22
100:16, 19,	161:1	239:7	181:20	231:23
23	192:6 217:5	misstating	182:4, 13	mparfitt@as
middle	mischaracter	239:10	183:6, 12, 25	hcraftlaw.co
6:12	ization	183:17	m 3:5	
23:12	130:7	mistaken	MSPH 4:15,	
79:23 82:5	mischaracter	9:2 53:2	23 69:11	
176:3	ized	96:10	104:12	
180:24	misclassificat	misunderstoo	mucinous	
237:6, 7	ion	107:21	MOORMAN	63:2
	69:20, 23	d	1:13 2:1	

Mueller	178:6	Newcastle-Ottawa	nonoccupational	71:10, 19
10:4	195:25		nonopen	74:15
multiple	243:17	146:1	NUMBER	
233:1, 5	need 42:2	147:14, 16	4:10 64:1,	
Murray	79:14	148:1	6 72:2	
248:9	80:11, 21	149:2	117:18	
	81:8 116:7	150:25	127:14, 16	
<N>	123:25	Newcastle-Ottawa's	146:4, 12, 22	
N.W 3:3	137:24		166:12	
name 6:10, 11, 12, 14	160:17	147:22	170:7	
11:13 17:2	177:7 200:8	news 43:23	173:9	
40:25 43:5, 7	needed 73:22	NHS 132:16	185:6	
53:4	89:13 108:4	NHSI 65:12,	187:5	
68:8	needs 18:8	13 151:13	normal	189:21
121:21	80:10	152:14	145:20	190:3
134:20	negatives	Nicolas	North 2:7	205:21
224:2	241:22	211:16	32:22	247:11
233:18	negligible	NIEHS	33:10 252:1	252:25
named	222:15	17:19	notably	numbers
238:13	neither	NIH 122:6,	195:13	126:21, 22
252:7	115:3	7 172:8	Notary	166:21
names 98:5	143:1	No._____Cha	252:4, 24, 25	187:14
Narod 89:7, 10, 12, 15	216:3	nge 250:2, 5,	note 48:12	217:16
	252:15	8, 11, 14, 17,	63:20	218:6
narrative	neutral 48:1	20 251:2, 5,	117:24	222:11
49:19	never 17:11,	8, 11, 14, 17,	notebook	232:13, 22
narrow	20	20	116:11	numerically
200:7	16 23:2	No._____Lin	noted 95:7	49:7
	32:21	e 250:2, 5, 8,	105:8	numerous
National	41:14 42:7	11, 14, 17, 20	118:24	51:14
210:20	46:5 53:11	251:2, 5, 8,	195:14	105:12
nature	98:4	11, 14, 17, 20	216:19	107:23
244:20	100:12	Nods 54:12	245:1 248:3	202:8
NCI 27:6, 20 28:2, 16	113:5	non 92:11	notes 7:11	Nurses 64:7,
32:22	122:24	nonasbestifor	45:9	9 65:14, 15
	128:7	m 106:21	notice 2:3	147:1, 5
NCI's 27:10	147:4	nondifferenti	noting	nutritional
nearly 93:7	167:8	al 69:19, 22	120:19	20:12
112:8	219:18	70:13 97:3	November	NY 3:18
193:23	NEW 1:2	nonexposed	44:2	
194:10	3:18 24:4	71:3 77:21	104:18, 20	<O>
227:22	44:5, 11	85:7	null 69:21	oath 249:14
necessarily	200:22	nongenital	70:16	252:11
149:11		128:7		obesity 31:1

object	6:20	142:10, 21		184:23	230:12, 13,
14:10	24:3	143:19	objectionable	189:11, 16	18, 22 231:3,
37:15	38:5	144:16, 19		190:1, 6, 20	10
40:21		149:5	objections	191:23, 24	occur 72:2
41:25		150:6	42:16 55:9	192:4, 13, 14,	219:20
109:13		151:2	207:5	18 193:18,	October
208:22		152:10	239:20	23 194:10	15:19 27:20
219:3		154:12	objective	211:8, 17	odds 67:19
220:1, 4, 6		155:18	146:9, 23	214:18	75:16 76:2,
240:5		156:14	O'Brien	221:14	15 77:12
Objection		157:15	5:22 17:10	222:17	95:18, 21
7:24	8:21,	158:11	51:6, 11, 15,	224:5	117:1
23	12:18	159:23	16, 18, 24	225:4	124:7, 15, 18,
14:9	22:16	165:4	52:1, 4, 12,	241:6, 7	20, 24 125:9,
27:14		170:14	25 58:8	242:12, 16,	25 126:13
28:20	29:7	176:21	59:2 61:19	17, 25 243:4,	158:1
32:8	40:14	178:12	62:22 64:4,	22 244:10,	194:16
41:17		180:16	21 65:2, 6,	16, 21, 24	224:22
42:11, 24		191:2, 25	12 71:24	245:15, 25	offer
44:7, 18		194:1	72:17, 18, 23	246:19	107:12, 22
48:3	49:18	196:14	73:4, 7	O'Brien's	204:25
50:5	51:20	197:4, 18, 22	74:16 75:3	62:18 79:4	205:15
52:13	53:9,	198:10	76:20, 24		249:14
18	55:6	199:1	77:8 81:18	observational	offered
60:3, 25		204:11, 19	82:12	41:3	108:1
75:24		205:2, 17	83:15	observed	227:21
88:21		206:23	87:11, 19	41:10	228:19
93:12		207:3, 13	89:11, 12	154:16	offering
94:18		208:5, 18	90:3 91:10,	213:8, 13	7:14 54:18,
103:19		209:13	19 92:7	214:20	24 106:15,
107:3, 10		214:11	105:2, 5	215:19	20 131:17,
108:5		218:10	125:21	246:24	21 227:18
110:3		219:12	130:21	obstructing	228:9, 16
118:7, 16		220:25	133:1, 22	239:15	offhand
126:5		226:9, 20	152:8	obvious	50:10 69:2
128:19		230:16	155:5	179:17	152:2
129:8		231:19	171:13, 24	186:23	office 45:6
130:18		232:10, 19	172:3, 7, 25	obviously	46:15
132:4		234:21	173:5	17:12 58:2	Off-the-
135:5, 25		236:11, 21	174:23	74:15 89:1	record
138:5		238:21	175:2	occupational	58:24
139:9, 10		239:7	177:18	107:14	67:15
140:6			178:19, 25	228:25	163:21
141:20			179:7, 14	229:1, 9	

171:11	100:17	208:19	28:16 30:4	
228:13	101:8, 12, 14	211:6	32:14	organizations
Ogunsina	106:19	213:5	52:21	20:21 21:2
172:3	108:9	220:2, 10	54:20, 23	107:13, 23
Oh 10:8	109:19	221:7, 12	55:1, 3	origin
11:22	111:16	224:17, 25	56:7, 25	206:18
78:14	116:5, 9, 12,	235:1	57:1	original
82:24	118:23	244:1	101:15, 21	44:13
107:20	119:1	246:22	102:3, 10, 16	55:10 65:9
175:19	124:10	247:4, 6, 20,	103:3, 6	99:10
210:16	127:4, 11	24	106:16, 20,	111:13
215:9 218:2	128:4	old 132:10	23 107:7, 12,	180:9
okay 6:20,	131:23, 25	older 131:5	22 108:1	originally
22 10:2, 6,	133:24	oldest	123:9	7:5 179:9
15 11:15	141:11	132:24	131:17, 21	originate
12:1, 3, 8, 12	151:15	once 17:7	199:19	206:10, 12
13:24	153:3, 19	58:6 94:6	200:10	originates
14:13	154:25	115:12	205:1, 15, 20	226:7
16:22 24:6,	158:16	118:23	208:3	orthotopic
17 29:18	161:14	138:10	219:1	225:24
30:21 31:2	162:5, 8, 13	155:19	220:22	outcome
33:21	163:3	156:15	227:18, 21,	71:8 178:1,
35:15	164:10, 14	168:22, 23	24 228:9, 16,	10
36:19	165:1	169:15	19 231:17	outlier 74:7
37:19, 22	166:16	170:23	235:23	193:7
38:15, 18	171:14	Oncology	opinions	outrageous
39:6, 8	172:17, 20,	5:17	20:5 54:18,	103:18
42:16, 23	173:7, 13	211:10, 25	24 90:22	144:23
44:20 47:3,	174:9	213:1	109:5	outside
9 57:24	175:22, 23	ones 9:10	195:3	40:12
58:17 61:6,	176:22	82:17	218:25	41:15 42:8
18 66:4, 13,	177:7	210:5	220:21	43:1 75:21
14, 16 69:3,	179:7, 13, 18,	241:11	235:25	110:21
22 73:17	20 180:18,	online 215:6	236:4	203:17
74:1, 5	21 181:5, 10,	open	opportunity	204:23
75:6 77:8	13 184:8	121:18, 19,	244:16	205:12
78:14 79:9,	187:23	24 122:2, 11,	opposed	208:15
13 80:2, 7,	188:22	16	159:20	Ovarian
13 81:5, 15,	189:1, 9, 20	operates	opted	4:11, 13, 18,
19 82:12, 18	191:22	68:25	165:22	22 5:1, 2, 4,
83:22 85:3	194:24	opinion	organization	9, 12, 16, 20
90:1, 5, 8	196:1, 10	7:14, 19	21:3 31:8,	7:20 19:8,
92:6 96:17	199:17	16:9, 13, 19,	11, 14 195:2	12, 22 20:2,
98:21	202:22	20 20:7		21 21:16, 20,

23 22:4, 10, 12, 25 23:6 24:1, 13, 23 25:6 32:3, 13, 15, 24 33:10, 12, 16 34:2 35:9 36:24 37:6, 13 38:4 39:10 40:13 41:11, 16 42:9 43:2 50:3, 13 54:19, 21, 23 55:2 56:5, 6, 21, 23 57:21 58:3, 12 59:9, 23 60:8 61:4, 25 62:1 74:17 78:6 82:4, 10 83:4, 9 85:23 86:17 87:9 90:13, 19 94:3 95:2, 7 102:9 106:21 107:2, 9, 15 108:4, 16, 24 113:3, 17 115:11, 18, 19 116:2, 24 117:10 119:23 120:4, 16, 20 123:24 124:1, 2, 4, 8, 15, 17, 25 126:3, 19 130:23 131:3, 10, 19	133:8, 17 134:4, 9 136:17 154:1 161:18 162:10 173:16, 21 174:2 179:8 181:19 195:9 196:4, 13 197:3, 9, 11 198:2, 19 199:12 202:24 206:9, 12, 17, 22 207:12, 21, 25 208:17 209:4, 12 210:22 211:10, 15 214:22 215:20 221:17, 20, 24 222:2, 6, 8, 25 223:13 225:20 226:6, 12, 15 227:2, 20 228:3, 18, 20, 23 229:2 230:15, 22 231:11, 18 232:5, 7, 17 236:10, 20 237:25 241:3 246:7 247:22 ovaries 206:10 225:6	overall 54:21, 23 55:2 56:6 59:21 64:5 77:11 85:20 86:5 93:6 94:4 147:6 148:14 198:20 212:2 overlap 77:9, 16 125:3, 5, 16, 17, 24 overlooked 77:6 oversight 88:24 oxidative 203:5 < P > P.C 3:10 p.m 119:5, 6 161:5 177:11 227:15 242:7 246:16 248:14 PA 3:14 PAGE 4:1, 10 13:22 30:20 83:21, 23 96:15, 20 98:19, 20 104:19 112:1 128:6 149:18, 19, 21, 22 155:14	181:14 211:18 213:5, 7 215:8, 9, 15, 17 224:15 225:3 250:2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20 251:2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20 212:18, 20 113:13 114:18 237:24 PAPANTON IO 3:5 paper 5:22 19:11, 14 20:25 21:6 33:3, 10, 14 34:1, 3, 19, 23 35:2, 8, 11, 17, 21, 22 36:7, 12, 23 37:7, 11, 21 38:19, 25 39:3, 9, 17 40:11 41:15 42:8 43:1 46:19 47:25 48:6, 7, 13, 16, 21 51:6, 14, 16, 18 52:7, 17 59:2 60:7 61:3 64:12 65:2, 7 68:13 69:18 73:1, 7 74:6 75:13 76:9, 24 77:2 79:4 80:10, 14, 21, 23	81:8, 18, 22, 23, 24 82:13, 25 83:11, 16 84:25 86:3 88:12 89:6, 10, 12, 15, 18 90:16, 21 91:10, 19 92:7 97:9, 21, 23 98:4 99:19 102:19 103:18 105:4, 5, 6, 8 108:13 112:13, 17 113:23, 25 114:21 115:1, 4, 8, 13, 25 116:1 117:24 119:15 120:9, 23 121:6, 14 124:7, 20 129:17 130:2, 23 133:2, 22, 25 134:2, 14, 21 135:8, 9, 18, 24 136:16 137:23 138:17 140:19 141:17 142:19 147:12 148:7 149:4, 15, 19 152:21 154:7, 24 155:2 158:10 159:8
---	--	---	--	--

160:9	103:25	9:7, 16	21 80:2, 5, 9,	25 159:23
161:9, 22	104:2	10:15, 20, 25	16, 20, 25	160:14, 21,
162:15	108:3	11:3, 17, 20,	81:3, 6	25 162:2
165:21	109:9	24 12:2, 18	84:9, 17, 21	163:1, 10, 18
166:4	110:6, 12	13:12, 18	88:21	164:3
167:16	131:13	14:9 22:16	93:12	165:4
168:7, 12	138:2, 6	23:23 24:4	94:18	166:1
170:4	140:4	25:8, 12, 15	98:16	170:14
172:3	141:6, 16	26:2, 7, 11	100:25	175:9, 13, 16,
173:2, 14	142:8	27:14	101:2	19, 22 176:1,
174:1, 5, 22	143:3, 5	28:20 29:7,	103:19	5, 21 178:12
183:16	157:6, 12, 21	18, 20, 23	107:3, 10	180:16, 23
184:11	159:19	30:4, 7, 9, 12,	108:5	182:19, 22
185:19	160:4	15, 18 32:8	109:13, 19	184:12, 15
186:25	167:24	33:17, 19, 22	110:1, 3	185:4, 13
187:4	168:1, 17	34:3, 13, 18,	111:6, 9, 11,	186:5, 8
195:1	170:25	25 35:5, 10,	15, 17, 19	187:18, 21,
203:7	171:8	13, 16, 23	118:7, 16	24 191:2, 25
209:10	190:24	36:4, 9, 12,	119:19	194:1
211:19, 23	191:3	18, 20, 25	126:5	196:14
213:2, 4	196:8	37:14, 17, 20	127:15	197:4, 18, 22
224:4, 5, 6, 9,	199:17, 24	38:1, 5, 9, 11,	128:19	198:10
12 225:2	201:2	14, 16, 19, 24	129:8	199:1, 20
231:9, 14	202:25	39:4, 12, 22	130:18	200:13, 19
236:7, 17	203:8, 13, 17	40:4, 14	132:4	202:4
237:4, 22	204:24	41:17, 20, 24	135:5, 25	204:11, 13,
238:7	205:14	42:11, 24	136:21, 25	19 205:2, 17
239:4	208:15	44:2, 7, 18	138:5	206:23
240:2	213:1	45:22 46:6,	139:9	207:13
244:10	215:6	11, 14, 21	140:6, 10	208:5, 18, 20
245:15, 25	224:21	47:3, 7, 10	141:20	209:3, 13
246:20	231:21	48:3 49:18	142:10, 21	214:11
papers 16:7,	paragraph	50:5, 16	143:1, 19	216:24
8 17:12, 25	83:24 84:2,	51:20	144:16, 19	217:8, 12
19:15, 18, 19,	12 85:2, 3	52:13 53:9,	149:5	218:10
21 21:5	181:14	18 55:6, 18	150:6	219:3, 10, 16,
33:6, 7	184:11	56:13 57:5,	151:2	20 220:1, 3,
40:16 45:2	215:1	9 58:22	152:10, 24	5, 9, 11, 13,
52:5, 12	pardon	60:3, 25	153:4, 9, 13	16, 25 226:9,
53:21 54:2	219:16	61:7, 13	154:12	20 229:3, 7,
56:5 78:25	PARFITT	63:15 66:6	155:18	17, 21 230:1,
80:18	3:2 4:4, 6	73:15, 19, 22	156:14	6, 10, 16
81:12 82:3,	6:25 7:24	74:2 75:24	157:15	231:19
9 97:6, 16	8:2, 21, 23	79:8, 14, 18,	158:11, 22,	232:10, 19

234:21	patency	PDQ	27:6, 8, 11 184:5, 6, 7 185:2,	permit
236:11, 21	78:5, 15	10, 12, 20	23 186:1, 12, 20, 24 187:5	195:10, 21
237:2, 6, 12	patent	28:3, 16	23 186:1, 12, 20, 24 187:5	permitted
238:21	59:11, 24	29:15, 19	23 186:1, 12, 20, 24 187:5	219:13
239:7, 16, 18	60:8 61:4	32:22	188:6, 7, 22, 23 189:21	person
240:5	77:9, 14, 20, 25	peer 103:17, 25 104:1	23 189:21 190:2	43:11
244:2, 5	78:7, 11	122:17	190:2 192:22, 23	121:13
245:8	85:6, 15	203:20	206:14	134:16
246:1	86:10 87:4	210:19	222:1, 6	138:23
247:9	125:21	peer-reviewed	percentage	187:21
248:11	151:25	103:12	13:2	252:6
parse	153:24	238:16, 18	101:16	personally
219:23	154:18	239:5 240:3	129:4	53:20 54:1, 5 67:1
part	161:12	PENALTY	184:3, 22	persuasive
20:14, 15, 24	176:19	249:3, 6	185:1	234:5
52:8 102:5	pathogenesis	pending	223:12	pertains
103:5	225:12	66:12 67:5	percentages	209:3
149:11	pathway	Pensacola	174:10	ph 1:19
166:19	201:19	3:9	Perfect	Ph.D 1:13
170:21	208:9, 13	pension	12:12	2:2 4:15,
201:6	pathways	14:8, 11, 18, 20	46:23 70:8	24 6:3
208:13	207:18	people	148:15	53:3 69:11
218:18	patients	17:19	perfectly	104:13
238:7, 20	22:21 58:7	40:21 59:3	188:7	249:22
particular	PATRICIA	69:25 70:2, 11, 12, 20, 24	performed	250:24
83:19, 20	1:13 2:1	71:2 94:1	166:5	251:24
115:1	4:15, 23	97:8	perineal	Pharma
126:12	6:3, 11	101:18	4:21 5:8	48:10
170:10, 19	69:10, 17	109:8	79:1 82:11	Philadelphia
171:9	104:12, 17	PATRICK	90:12, 18	3:14 10:12
174:5	249:22	141:13	134:4, 8	11:8, 19, 20,
197:16	250:24	178:8	136:18	23
208:25	251:24	Patterns	phrased	241:25
245:1	3:3	203:21	phrasing	37:3, 6
particularly	5:14 60:12	percent	191:1	112:25
28:23	171:18, 23	14:4 85:16, 18	227:23	113:6, 14
136:13	191:14	128:14,	period	114:4, 11, 12,
223:2, 9	222:24, 25	22 130:4	180:6	14 145:12
parties	pay 122:4	179:9, 11	210:12	169:19
252:18	payment	180:2, 8, 9, 13, 14 182:5,	PERJURY	234:6
parts 16:12	121:2, 7	8, 13 183:5,		
48:7 185:18				

Phung	5:6	233:11	20	178:24	Powder
119:15, 17		241:5	plus	179:22	4:11, 16, 21
124:6		planned	point	244:23	5:1, 8, 20
127:8, 13, 18,		19:18	21:17		7:15, 19, 23
22 130:1		planning	24:20	100:16, 18	58:5, 11
physician		84:24	67:17	poor	59:14
18:25		plans	74:23 75:1	63:13	81:13
physicians		plausibility	89:25 93:6,	population	82:10 83:4,
22:20		102:2, 4, 6	7, 17, 19		9 85:23
picked		199:18	94:14	117:11	86:17 87:8
169:14		200:11	124:22	221:23, 25	90:13, 18
piece	46:19	201:7, 16	125:8	222:3	101:16
Pittsboro		202:3, 12, 18,	131:9	position	115:18
2:6		20 205:1, 5,	132:19	203:22	116:1, 23
place	176:10	16, 21 206:7	138:1	positive	134:4, 9
places		plausible	139:23	74:11, 14	136:18
105:12		102:7	140:5, 24	possibility	137:4
plaintiff		107:25	141:8, 18	180:12	138:3
120:21, 24		please	142:9, 20	possible	158:18
121:10		24:6 31:18	156:19	95:7	159:21
238:4		35:16 42:4,	167:10	104:21, 24	165:22
Plaintiffs		21 57:8	169:22	105:25	167:25
3:5 16:2		63:15	170:19	146:19	168:8, 12, 20,
51:7 57:4,		66:13	180:10	150:22	25 170:22
14, 18, 22		73:20 81:1	205:8	195:6	173:1
238:20, 23		84:10	208:15	231:23	174:7, 24
241:12		100:14	209:10, 15	possibly	179:10
244:11		116:21	210:6, 16	71:4 126:10	190:18
plaintiff's		157:16	215:2	potential	211:10, 15
50:4, 14		182:19	228:4, 7	23:10	214:21
51:3, 10, 19		185:13	231:25	24:13	215:20
87:17 98:2,		194:3	232:14, 23	47:18, 20, 21,	216:23
5 101:23		202:4, 5	233:21	23 52:23	217:20
111:5		205:19	243:11	88:13 97:2,	218:3
112:4, 17		207:4	244:13	5 105:2	powder-
113:13		217:8	245:5	123:17	related
114:18		220:12	pointed	132:6, 7, 12,	213:10
121:15		229:13	60:10	15, 21 178:7,	POWER
123:1, 14		236:14	pointing	16 196:11,	1:6 64:11
136:10		237:8, 21	132:5, 13	25 206:1	89:6, 14, 18
204:9, 16		239:18	points	210:24	90:2, 6
216:16		247:19	78:18 79:5	216:7	249:3
218:9, 24		PLM 100:8,	88:17, 18	pounce	
220:20			150:24	175:25	

Practice	143:25	215:9	product	proposition
18:23, 24	147:10	224:24	99:23, 25	89:7
19:2 128:1	148:14	privileges	136:18	protecting
	166:22	17:3	178:9	126:19
PRACTICES	212:2	probably	201:23	protective
1:7 249:3	233:23	8:14 9:23	216:25	28:22 29:3
pre-'19	235:9	13:5 14:3	217:1	provide
200:16	prevalence	18:14, 19	PRODUCTS	152:8, 16
precisely	183:11	33:12	1:6, 7 5:8	157:7 236:3
233:18	192:24	43:18	20:11	provided
pre-COVID	193:23	45:23 52:7	102:5, 10, 15,	11:10 12:9
18:15	194:11	89:22 97:7	17 106:24	33:11 45:6,
prefer	214:7	112:7, 9	109:1, 2, 3	25 46:2
213:23	previous	115:5	111:3	49:19
preferable	33:6, 7	120:18	134:4, 9	127:5
214:2	72:6 85:9	127:3 234:5	173:2	149:1
premenopaus	118:19	problem	201:17	152:14
al 131:16	234:14, 16,	66:17 97:8	205:25	234:9
prepare 7:1	17	178:11	216:9, 13	provides
46:22	previously	Procedure	218:21, 23	174:20
presence	7:8 45:19,	2:4	219:2	public 20:1,
205:24	21 108:10	procedures	220:19, 24	20 21:1, 3
present	209:25	145:20	249:3	31:17, 23
18:7	220:25	proceeding	professional	114:2, 13
159:25	234:15	45:16	123:4	116:11
185:18	primarily	proceedings	professionall	122:9
	67:13	9:5 40:7	y 17:17	214:5
presentations	103:3, 10	66:20	professor	222:12, 18
110:16	printing	119:5	16:24 18:2,	252:5, 24, 25
presented	124:10	161:5	7	publication
86:2	prior	177:11	program	54:15
presenting	130:24	227:15	19:1	122:12
144:5	138:2	242:7	progress	213:4
prestigious	180:1, 13, 14	246:16	19:20, 25	240:20
54:14	182:14	process	proper	publications
presumably	183:6, 12, 25	26:18, 23	143:13	19:7 20:24
103:16	184:5	27:1	proportion	151:23, 24
presume	185:10	122:18	101:21	152:5
129:13	186:12, 14	149:7	proportions	publish
pretty	189:22, 25	processes	174:15	204:6
68:10	190:15	149:16	proposed	published
71:21	205:5	151:10	225:21	19:21 33:6,
96:12	212:24	produced	226:3, 4	10 37:8
133:4		103:13		40:11

41:15	42:8	142:4	56:9, 12, 14	211:1	160:10
45:3	47:25	162:7	60:19, 22, 24	212:21	196:15
48:1	53:14	169:11	61:1, 8	217:11, 23	222:13
54:22		193:17	66:11, 12, 13,	219:8, 25	230:20
75:13		putting	15 67:4, 7, 8	220:8, 15, 18	quote
89:11		70:24	75:20 76:9	221:10	213:22
99:14		224:11	78:10	228:1	214:19
110:12			80:14	229:16, 20	219:1
113:25		< Q >	81:20 82:6,	230:4, 5, 9,	220:23
114:11, 12		qualified	8 91:14, 17,	11 234:18	235:5
120:18		99:22, 24	25 94:22	236:13, 16	
194:25		218:8	95:11	237:11, 14,	< R >
209:10		qualifiers	107:18	20 239:9, 14,	race 173:10
211:23, 24		195:23	108:8	23 240:1, 13	RAFFERTY
212:4		quality	109:24	241:25	3:5
237:4, 22		97:11	116:13, 20	242:10	raise 130:9
238:16, 17		136:8	129:15	questioning	raised
242:25		146:4	130:14	6:24	244:25
246:20		147:18	139:5, 12	questionnair	raises 188:5
publishing		149:20	140:3	e 72:5	random
246:6		150:1, 12, 16,	142:15	129:15	126:11
247:20		18 210:2, 23	144:12	181:22, 23	randomized
pull 79:6		211:4	148:23	224:24	40:23
82:18		quantified	157:17, 19	questions	range
115:12		105:5	158:21, 23	17:25 31:4	122:14
203:8		quantify	159:16	34:8 35:21	125:10, 17
purpose		214:16	166:25	82:1	ranitidine
143:9		quantitative	172:12	102:22	240:21
159:7		49:12	175:15, 18	106:18	rarity
207:8		question	176:4	119:15	221:16
243:14		6:19 9:14	178:19	176:6	rate 15:12
pursuant		10:19, 23	184:17	219:6	146:3
2:3		14:11	185:21	229:14, 22	rates 232:18
pushback		23:12, 16, 17,	186:19	239:21	ratings
113:5		19 30:1	193:12	242:11	148:18
put 13:21		31:21 35:1,	194:4, 7	245:9	ratio 59:8,
28:7 39:25		18 36:5, 9	195:18	247:5	11 62:7, 23
45:4, 5		37:1, 10, 25	196:20, 21,	248:12	63:6 67:18,
46:5, 15		38:9, 13, 17,	22, 23 197:8	quibble	19 73:11, 13
96:18		22 39:1, 5,	198:13	164:24	74:7 75:16,
97:13		13, 21, 23	205:3, 10, 11	quite 39:9	22 76:10, 15
116:7		41:21 42:2,	207:5, 9	40:19 77:1	77:12
139:14		4, 6, 14, 19,	209:7	93:22	85:17 92:9
141:2		22 51:8	210:14	122:21	94:9 95:4,

18	117:2	92:4, 19, 23,	215:5	Rebecca	157:25
	124:7, 15, 18,	25 95:19	231:21	134:18	167:1, 7, 14
20, 24	125:9,	99:19	240:8	recall	168:1, 5, 18,
21	126:13	102:21	242:21	8:3, 4,	20 169:20
	154:14	103:1, 5	ready	16 11:12	
	158:1	109:9	12:23 15:7	12:23 15:7	170:9, 17, 21
	159:17	110:6	175:25	19:5 20:4	171:9
	164:14	115:23	real	21:10, 18, 21,	173:25
	165:14	118:10	74:7	25 24:21, 24	174:1, 4
	194:16	128:10	realize	27:10, 11	177:4, 25
	224:22	134:21, 22,	127:1, 9	33:25	178:9, 21
rationale	25 157:19	37:15, 20	really	34:15 35:7	179:3, 5
	234:23, 24	57:15	8:22	36:16, 22	190:24
	235:10	60:13	37:2, 7, 11	37:2, 7, 11	196:2, 3
ratios	59:15	63:13	38:2, 7, 22	38:2, 7, 22	199:10
	76:3 85:15	194:7	70:22	39:2, 8, 21	209:22
	125:25	196:9, 23	105:5	40:10	210:24
	157:7, 11, 21	199:24	123:7, 19	42:25	212:7
reach	17:24	200:8	129:18	43:11 50:9,	218:6
	197:16	203:16	145:11	10, 12, 18	224:13, 16
reached	207:9	163:15	163:15	51:5, 9, 12	230:20
	20:20	167:5	167:5	52:9, 10	231:6, 21, 24
	22:11	215:6	170:6	60:19	232:2, 4, 12
	24:11 28:2,	220:18	181:1	64:14 70:5,	233:7, 10
	15 32:17, 21	223:18	187:9	8 74:6	234:22, 24
reaching	230:5, 9, 11	230:5, 9, 11	203:21	82:3, 9, 12,	238:6
	218:20	231:25	223:2	14 83:11	240:7, 19, 23,
	236:16	reason	14 83:11	24 241:8	
read	6:17	239:4	167:5	recalled	
	7:18 16:9,	240:1, 2	48:20 53:7,	19, 21, 24	
	10, 11, 17, 18	246:3	10 54:3	91:12, 21	
	17:12 20:7	247:18	71:12	97:2 99:16,	
	31:21 42:6	249:7, 9	83:14, 19, 20	18, 20 103:2	
	43:23 48:6	reader	86:20	104:7	
	50:18, 25	114:21, 25	96:21	105:19, 20	
	51:2 52:4,	115:5	126:1, 8	108:13	
	7 54:1	117:13	193:3	130:25	
	56:14 61:1	reading	250:4, 7, 10,	131:7, 13	
	67:8 76:19,	49:14, 15	13, 16, 19, 22	221:24	
	25 80:22	83:11	251:4, 7, 10,	recalling	
	83:18 84:5,	121:13	13, 16, 19, 22	20 141:10,	
	7, 12, 18, 20,	135:14, 21	reasoning	231:14	
	24 85:2, 3,	151:17	137:21	232:13, 23	
	13 89:1	163:17	143:3, 5	recalls	
	91:17, 25	214:24	72:2 206:5,	34:12, 22	
			6 235:3	36:14 38:12	
				received	
				47:12	
				47:12	
				57:25	

113:2, 9, 15, 16 135:22 136:6 247:1 receives 146:25 recess 9:4 40:6 66:19 119:5 161:4 177:10 227:14 242:6 246:15 recognized 195:16 recollection 158:14 196:2 242:17 recollections 167:2 recommendations 22:3 record 6:10 9:1 10:16 23:20 24:16 42:17 45:22 58:18 81:4 84:25 115:24 118:22 119:2 177:17 184:12 228:12 230:7, 8 242:4 246:12 247:18 252:13 recorded 117:9, 18	recording 224:20 records 12:13 redo 219:5 redox 203:4 reduce 22:3 reduced 252:11 reduces 187:3 refer 105:18 247:10 reference 88:25 213:18, 19 referenced 241:10, 11 references 45:17 98:8 referencing 136:21 referred 103:17 referring 33:3, 4 73:15, 17 106:1 150:8 223:10 225:13 refers 69:23 reflect 60:11 247:24 248:8 reflected 76:11 reflecting 126:10 149:11 reflection	26:8 reflects 70:4 refresh 242:16 refuse 36:10 refusing 39:20 214:9 regard 14:10 17:3 19:19 131:22 154:9 208:25 247:17 regarding 14:11 51:11 57:18 76:20 regardless 7:20 registered 244:21 regulatory 195:1 202:9 rejected 204:4, 17 213:1 rejections 204:10 relate 60:24 related 18:12 19:16 20:11 33:6 54:20, 23 55:1 88:6 96:4 98:9 reflect 104:5 227:21, 23 252:16 relation 106:3, 12 113:3, 16 167:9	169:20 192:3, 19 233:25 relationship 61:24 196:12 197:1 237:18 238:5 relative 59:25 61:9 63:1 67:18 95:18, 21 181:22 193:5 213:25 214:1, 6 221:15 245:3 relatively 210:11 221:20 Relevance 14:9 204:13 Relevancy 208:5 relevant 14:12 55:14 97:20 125:6 Reliability 5:14 123:15 143:12 171:19, 23 177:19, 25 178:10 181:17 203:12 204:24 205:13 218:8 167:9	reliable 63:10, 12 149:2 reliably 203:19 reliance 77:4 162:15 relied 173:15 201:15 relies 239:5 240:4 rely 238:19 relying 81:15 90:21 102:19, 25 199:18 200:10 218:16, 25 220:22 221:8 245:6 remaining 16:22 remember 20:8, 9 32:4, 9, 10 66:14 77:5, 7 82:16 100:24 168:2 171:7 178:8 191:8 193:12 194:6 196:7 199:15 223:25 237:20 238:11, 12, 14
---	---	---	--	---

remembering	49:14, 15 59:19, 20 18:18	192:3, 12 193:4, 17 195:14	180:5, 6, 15 181:21 182:5	187:4, 10 198:19 245:5
remind	43:5	62:14, 17, 21	199:4	183:10, 15
Remotely		64:14, 20, 25	211:19	247:25
	3:3, 8, 13	65:16, 22	212:18, 22	7:22, 25
reorient		68:9 69:4, 119:14	213:6, 18, 25 214:15	11:10 44:25
	4, 5 56:8	7, 10, 16	217:16	60:11 65:9
repeat		75:16 79:8, 31:18 42:2,	233:1	101:20, 24
	60:23	15 83:14	234:1, 14, 16, 5, 7 93:7	103:8, 9
	66:13 67:6	88:20 91:4, 23:17	17 236:23	121:2
	91:16 92:3	94:4, 11, 17, 24 95:6, 11,	237:1, 16	135:1
	95:17	12, 17 97:10,	238:10, 19	140:19
	157:16, 18	13 98:12	240:9	155:9
	194:3, 5	99:6 104:9,	241:10, 12	167:12
	196:19, 22	12, 17, 20	241:16	178:20
	205:9	105:1, 11	242:1	195:13
	207:4	111:15	243:1	221:25
	220:8, 14	112:2, 9	244:1	233:3, 9
	236:14	117:1, 6, 21,	245:1	238:20, 24
	237:21	23 118:25	246:1	239:6 240:4
	239:14	119:10	247:1	represent
repeated		124:20, 23	248:1	221:4
	125:13	128:20, 21	249:1	representatio
	215:23	130:2, 3, 16,	250:1	n 25:13
	236:13	23, 25 131:2,	251:1	represented
repeatedly		15 133:20,	252:1	26:5
	88:11	21 135:4, 7,	253:1	represents
	110:8	14, 15, 21, 23	254:1	14:3
	140:12	136:6	255:1	Reproductive
	243:7	140:17	256:1	4:20 59:12
repeating		141:14	257:1	77:14 78:5,
	91:24	143:4	258:1	7, 8 86:10
reply		150:9	259:1	87:5 90:10
	198:16	153:21	260:1	reputable
	244:16, 20	166:12	261:1	212:1
Report	4:15, 23 9:23	174:6 175:1, 3	262:1	reputation
	10:3 11:13	179:16	263:1	66:24
	12:9 28:8	187:7	264:1	requested
	43:6, 10, 13, 16, 25 48:17	190:20 191:16, 22	265:1	92:4
		174:13, 14 179:2, 9, 21	266:1	
			267:1	
			268:1	
			269:1	
			270:1	
			271:1	
			272:1	
			273:1	
			274:1	
			275:1	
			276:1	
			277:1	
			278:1	
			279:1	
			280:1	
			281:1	
			282:1	
			283:1	
			284:1	
			285:1	
			286:1	
			287:1	
			288:1	
			289:1	
			290:1	
			291:1	
			292:1	
			293:1	
			294:1	
			295:1	
			296:1	
			297:1	
			298:1	
			299:1	
			300:1	
			301:1	
			302:1	
			303:1	
			304:1	
			305:1	
			306:1	
			307:1	
			308:1	
			309:1	
			310:1	
			311:1	
			312:1	
			313:1	
			314:1	
			315:1	
			316:1	
			317:1	
			318:1	
			319:1	
			320:1	
			321:1	
			322:1	
			323:1	
			324:1	
			325:1	
			326:1	
			327:1	
			328:1	
			329:1	
			330:1	
			331:1	
			332:1	
			333:1	
			334:1	
			335:1	
			336:1	
			337:1	
			338:1	
			339:1	
			340:1	
			341:1	
			342:1	
			343:1	
			344:1	
			345:1	
			346:1	
			347:1	
			348:1	
			349:1	
			350:1	
			351:1	
			352:1	
			353:1	
			354:1	
			355:1	
			356:1	
			357:1	
			358:1	
			359:1	
			360:1	
			361:1	
			362:1	
			363:1	
			364:1	
			365:1	
			366:1	
			367:1	
			368:1	
			369:1	
			370:1	
			371:1	
			372:1	
			373:1	
			374:1	
			375:1	
			376:1	
			377:1	
			378:1	
			379:1	
			380:1	
			381:1	
			382:1	
			383:1	
			384:1	
			385:1	
			386:1	
			387:1	
			388:1	
			389:1	
			390:1	
			391:1	
			392:1	
			393:1	
			394:1	
			395:1	
			396:1	
			397:1	
			398:1	
			399:1	
			400:1	
			401:1	
			402:1	
			403:1	
			404:1	
			405:1	
			406:1	
			407:1	
			408:1	
			409:1	
			410:1	
			411:1	
			412:1	
			413:1	
			414:1	
			415:1	
			416:1	
			417:1	
			418:1	
			419:1	
			420:1	
			421:1	
			422:1	
			423:1	
			424:1	
			425:1	
			426:1	
			427:1	
			428:1	
			429:1	
			430:1	
			431:1	
			432:1	
			433:1	
			434:1	
			435:1	
			436:1	
			437:1	
			438:1	
			439:1	
			440:1	
			441:1	
			442:1	
			443:1	
			444:1	
			445:1	
			446:1	
			447:1	
			448:1	
			449:1	
			450:1	
			451:1	
			452:1	
			453:1	
			454:1	
			455:1	
			456:1	
			457:1	
			458:1	
			459:1	
			460:1	
			461:1	
			462:1	
			463:1	
			464:1	
			465:1	
			466:1	
			467:1	
			468:1	
			469:1	
			470:1	
			471:1	
			472:1	
			473:1	
			474:1	
			475:1	
			476:1	
			477:1	
			478:1	
			479:1	
			480:1	
			481:1	
			482:1	
			483:1	
			484:1	
			485:1	
			486:1	
			487:1	
			488:1	
			489:1	
			490:1	
			491:1	
			492:1	
			493:1	
			494:1	
			495:1	
			496:1	
			497:1	
			498:1	
			499:1	
			500:1	
			501:1	
			502:1	
			503:1	
			504:1	
			505:1	
			506:1	
			507:1	
			508:1	
			509:1	
			510:1	
			511:1	
			512:1	
			513:1	
			514:1	
			515:1	
			516:1	
			517:1	
			518:1	
			519:1	
			520:1	
			521:1	
			522:1	
			523:1	
			524:1	
			525:1	
			526:1	
			527:1	
			528:1	
			529:1	
			530:1	
			531:1	
			532:1	
			533:1	
			534:1	
			535:1	
			536:1	
			537:1	
			538:1	
			539:1	
			540:1	
			541:1	
			542:1	
			543:1	
			544:1	
			545:1	
			546:1	
			547:1	
			548:1	
			549:1	
			550:1	

require	73:12	57:17, 25	87:17	223:20
68:4, 14	176:19	58:6	88:16 90:3	224:5, 8
121:23		resulted	92:18 93:3	226:19
requirement	245:3	110:23	94:23	227:9
122:6		127:22		227:9
	results	147:13, 19	111:21	230:25
	52:19	230:19	115:11	244:15
requirements	71:11	231:9, 16	116:17, 20	246:20
68:18	143:17	reviewers	118:6	247:16
reread	144:4, 5, 8,	103:17	125:22	rigid 148:24
230:4	11, 14, 24	reviewing	128:8, 11, 14,	Risk 4:11,
Research	145:2, 9, 12,	8:4 16:8	18 129:2	13, 18, 21
17:13	17, 21, 23, 24	47:17	130:5, 24	5:1, 4, 12
246:6	158:10	48:24	138:18	21:16, 23
247:21	199:7, 15	147:20	139:18, 19	22:4, 10, 25
Reserved	retained	233:20	140:3, 20, 25	23:5, 10, 25
248:15	233:14	reviews	141:5	24:13, 22
respect	244:11, 12	96:11	142:1, 3	25:6, 24
7:22 51:18	retired 13:6	review's	143:18	26:13, 22
62:19 90:3	17:7 18:4	89:23	149:21, 22	28:14, 18
229:23	retirement	revise 28:3	150:12	32:2, 13, 14,
respected	14:2	revised	151:5	23 37:5
31:7, 10, 13,	retiring	44:16	152:2	40:18 41:4,
16, 22	233:22	rgolomb@google.com	154:22	11 55:12
respond	Retrospectively 5:17	lombhonik.com	162:5, 16	58:11 60:1
35:1	173:17, 22	RICHARD	165:20	61:9 63:1
responded	247:1	3:13	167:8	67:18
review	4:20	ridiculous	172:8	74:17, 22
response	5:9 8:9	177:3		75:14, 19, 22,
5:22 34:25	17:8 26:21	219:9, 12		23 76:4, 5, 6,
35:18	28:8 52:18	right 8:8	178:11	10, 11, 15, 18
118:11	90:11, 17	12:17	179:14	
197:8	103:25	13:15	182:2, 9	78:5, 8
237:7	104:1	14:14	183:18, 24	83:5, 10
244:10	122:17	17:15 20:7	184:3	85:24
245:15, 25	128:2	26:7 29:2	185:7	86:18 87:3,
rest 184:10	134:5, 10	31:17, 23	187:6, 17	9 90:13, 18
restate 24:7	137:7, 12	32:21	190:3	91:1, 8
97:15	202:24	37:24 44:1,	191:24	92:13 93:5
102:17	203:20	3, 16 50:10	196:22	94:3, 4, 6, 9,
restating	210:19	58:8, 19	199:6, 14	14 95:3, 19
91:14	244:16	60:9 61:5	202:18	96:22
result 69:19	reviewed	68:7 69:1,	211:20	115:18
71:18	7:8, 21	5 75:8	213:2	116:1
	46:20 47:2	82:24	215:4	117:4, 10
			222:19	119:22

120:3, 20	routine	86:14, 22	scheduled	149:1, 3
123:23	50:19	88:15	7:5	151:5, 9
124:2, 5	Row	114:6	Schildkraut	Scott 27:9
126:2, 20	164:7, 8	126:18	33:8, 14	screwed
133:11	royal	131:7	34:1 36:17,	127:3
136:17	ruckus	138:21	22 167:7	second 9:1
144:13	80:12	143:5	224:5, 6, 9,	164:3, 5, 8
157:11, 20	Rule	145:11	12, 19	seconds
159:5	4:13 10:24 11:2	178:13, 15	science	24:2
161:18	69:9, 16	182:16	55:24	second-year
162:10	213:11	184:9	198:23, 24	19:3
164:14	Rules	185:15	218:13	section 22:2
165:14	2:4 6:18	218:18	226:6	133:21
166:10		229:14	scientific	162:19
193:5	< S >	230:1	47:17 50:2	166:16
202:14, 18	S.A	237:13	56:2, 16	see 13:10
213:25	Saed's	240:19	108:2	22:23 25:8,
214:1, 6, 22	safe	243:10	110:17	24 32:2
215:21	108:12	says 18:6	112:5	34:10
216:5	202:10, 21	22:1 27:20	202:9	44:15, 20
221:15, 16,	SALES	36:23	206:21, 24	50:20 52:5
23 222:1, 3,	1:7 249:3	46:19	207:11, 15	77:3 80:21,
10 223:3, 6,	sample	74:23	237:4, 23	23 83:24
22 225:15	59:4 63:9, 11, 20,	86:15	238:3, 8	84:2 89:11
227:3	23 64:1	128:7	239:5	92:23
231:11	133:4, 15	136:17	240:3 241:1	96:23, 24
243:16	166:20	138:17	scientist 8:6	98:11, 22
245:4	181:19	155:14	110:20	100:22
247:22	235:4	163:16	200:3	101:24
risks 95:8,	samples	173:5	203:2, 16	111:1
21	216:19, 20	183:20	236:8, 18	115:1
RMR 2:5	Sandler	185:22	237:24	116:5
252:4	172:4	186:11	240:20	125:3, 15
road 209:5	satisfied	188:14	scientists	137:14
Rothman	89:12	246:5	226:16	148:8, 11
244:9, 18, 22,	200:11	Scale 146:1	240:12	149:20
25 247:12	satisfy	147:14, 16,	score	150:2
248:5	165:1 save 106:18	22, 23 148:1	146:25	153:21
Rotman	249:10	149:2	148:9	161:13
233:16	saw 99:11	150:25	210:23	162:23
roughly	saying	151:6	211:4	164:1
128:21	16:15	scales 146:2	scores	173:2
174:12	70:21 76:8	147:16	148:3, 4, 22	174:5, 10
	79:16	149:9		176:7

178:22	182:3	228:6	showing	87:3, 7
184:8	185:16	252:20	13:13	91:10, 20
190:22	seminars	setting	shown 71:6	92:12, 18, 22
200:4	17:5	136:7	shows	93:2, 4, 11,
213:15, 16	send 112:4	settled	40:18	21 94:2, 7,
223:14	189:15	169:22	71:16	13 95:1, 4,
224:17	senior	seven 37:8	128:6	14 115:9
242:20	115:4	SGO 24:17	155:16	116:25
245:4 247:3	134:17	26:9, 25	sic 82:5	117:4, 7, 15
seeing	242:14	27:3 31:13	121:4	164:17, 19
21:21	sense 74:14	32:22	174:3	165:16, 18
50:12 87:2	sentence	SGO's	201:5	166:10, 18,
104:8	79:23 84:3,	26:16	223:13	24 183:17
163:9, 10	5, 7, 14 85:4,	share 28:16	side 112:21	193:25
179:3	13 92:20, 21	43:13, 16	121:10	194:12, 20,
223:20	101:13	171:1, 3	240:12	22 195:20
seen 50:6	132:2	204:16	247:24	significantly
53:4, 12	136:24	shared	Signature	154:15
71:13 99:8	179:4 215:3	111:1, 4	248:15	193:24
101:20	separate	112:11	SIGNATUR	194:12
103:21, 25	153:23	SHEET	E:_____	similar
104:2, 4	serious	249:1, 13	_____	26:23
106:12	105:6	250:1 251:1	DATE	149:9
110:7	191:23	she'll 30:9	250:23	181:18
191:16	192:13	35:17	251:23	198:15
216:15, 18	193:21	Shook 27:9	Signed	simple 38:6
select	194:8	short	249:17	simply
143:21	serous 63:1	160:21, 22	significance	109:24
selected	225:22	Shorthand	67:21	130:14
145:5	226:7, 13	2:5	68:12, 15	140:3
235:22	SERVICES	short-term	93:14	144:12
selection	1:19	191:17	166:19	159:16
143:13, 18	serving	show 7:7	245:7	211:1
144:2	246:2, 6, 10	12:13	significant	
146:15	247:21	35:22	59:16, 22	Simultaneous
self-report	set 138:1	37:21	62:12, 23	101:3
183:20	139:24	70:17 75:2	63:4, 6	109:18
Self-	140:23	93:2, 10, 19	67:24 68:1	simultaneous
reported	141:23	131:9	74:25	ly 235:23
5:14	143:24	197:25	75:19, 22	single 16:18
171:19, 24	145:22, 24	199:11	76:11, 17	45:19 63:5
177:19	149:7	showed	85:14, 22	130:8 241:1
181:20	156:16	60:21	86:5, 9, 12,	sister 72:5,
	157:13, 23	92:17, 22	16, 23, 24	20 73:8

74:18	169:19	189:6	232:13	122:20, 22,
82:13	194:17	190:21	238:13	25 123:3, 5
132:16	small	191:21	240:24	spouse's
189:21	166:22	198:22	specifically	14:6
190:1, 3	213:22, 24	201:11	32:10	St 3:8
194:18	214:10	210:15	54:25 57:1	stamp 120:1
sitting	222:10	215:14, 22	64:24	standard
34:15 35:7	Smith-	231:12	72:21	145:20
36:1 40:10	Bindman	239:12	82:14, 16	167:4 173:9
55:23 56:1,	134:19	sort 90:2	95:20	standards
15 170:11	148:8	sound	99:18	68:9
206:20	Smith-	12:17, 24	107:11	122:12, 15
207:10	Bindman's	sounds 44:3	108:14	144:22
209:9	135:23	146:12	133:8, 23	standpoint
six 57:22,	136:6	source	148:2	93:18
23 58:2	smoking	47:22, 23	157:25	107:23
size 59:5	225:19	sources	158:2	113:21
63:11, 20	sold 101:16	47:18, 20	159:11	137:9 221:7
64:1 133:4,	sole 102:6	48:8 221:8	166:3	stands 101:6
15 166:20	somebody	South 3:8	171:8	stapled
214:6	50:3	speak 20:23	198:11	127:10
sizes 63:10,	somewhat	207:15	200:17	start 79:2
23 235:4	146:21, 23	226:15	224:13	80:18
SKADDEN	192:5	speaking	231:15, 24	81:13 82:4,
3:15	soon 162:6	43:11	238:13	10 126:7
skew	sorry 8:25	122:16	specification	173:1
143:17	10:25 12:3	speaks 24:5	155:7	174:24
144:13, 24	13:9 23:14,	33:1	specifics	175:5
skewed	21 41:24	specialists	123:7	started
145:3, 24	51:7 54:9	109:8	203:23	112:23
skewing	55:24 57:5	specialty	specified	119:10
144:10	61:21	99:25	238:6	starting
145:9, 12, 17	71:19	specific	specify	8:14 72:11
skip 112:1	82:22 84:6	7:25 25:16	152:17	starts 83:23,
SLATE	87:23	46:24 58:7	155:3	25 163:1
3:15	91:23	85:2	161:13	state 6:9
slide 110:19	106:8	123:25	spectro	33:15
slight 74:19,	107:20	169:21	101:2	40:12
22 76:6	121:2	174:4	speculative	95:12
slightly	153:8	195:7	132:3	101:20
65:25	161:23	213:10, 19	spelled 43:7	117:5
67:10	163:9	223:17	spoken	118:19
108:7	175:20, 21	224:8	17:21 20:1	121:11
125:14, 15	186:6	227:3		131:2

145:8	25	213:18,	93:4, 11, 21	6, 10 96:4, 7	131:9
156:11	20	214:23	94:2, 7, 13	240:16	132:7, 16
181:6	216:1, 11		95:1, 4, 14	strengths	133:5, 6, 9,
213:6	219:24		115:9	49:20	14 143:8, 13,
214:4, 18	221:18		116:24	133:1, 3, 15,	18, 21 144:2,
221:15	222:13		117:4, 6, 14	22 149:23	6, 9, 24
236:4, 5	225:7, 9		125:11, 18	209:25	145:5, 25
252:1	226:1, 2		154:15	stress	146:4, 7
stated	240:24		164:17, 19	stretch	147:10, 11
52:15	STATES		165:16, 18	160:24	148:4, 5, 19
68:19 76:9	1:1 5:17		166:10, 17,	strong	149:20
88:11 89:9	34:1 35:8		24 193:24	133:6	150:1, 16, 18,
93:13	41:16 42:9		194:12, 20,	147:7	22, 25 156:5,
94:23 95:5,	96:20		22	148:12	7, 22, 23
6 106:23	101:17		status 178:1,	234:8	157:3, 25
107:24	149:19, 25		10	stronger	158:6
108:10	173:18, 23		stemmed	131:15	159:13
117:21	177:22		135:4	146:7	161:11
143:2	241:2		Steve 10:4	strongly	169:4, 6, 7,
151:6	static 223:6		43:7 233:16	131:3, 10, 18	12, 16, 18, 24
179:14, 15	stating 86:1		sticker	225:19	170:1, 3
192:5	100:15		116:7 162:7	struck 240:9	176:25
197:25	181:13		sticking	stuck 113:7	191:9, 16
203:1, 14	208:16		224:3	student 53:6	197:9, 10, 15
209:24	225:1		stop 15:17	students	198:17, 18
218:11	237:16		18:10	18:25 19:2,	199:4, 10
225:1	Statistical		239:15	3 48:5	200:8, 9
235:3	67:21		stopped	studied	203:24
237:17	68:11, 14		18:4	117:11	205:3, 7
238:11	86:12		straight	studies 49:8,	209:22
246:23	93:14		6:23	16, 17, 21	210:4, 7, 9,
statement	166:19		straightforw	64:3, 15, 23	13, 18, 25
28:11	245:6		ard 174:20	65:5, 8	221:22
69:19	statistically		stratification	68:6 72:4	223:10, 11,
85:25 86:1,	59:16		77:18, 19	82:14 89:6,	16, 21 224:1,
8, 11, 21	62:12, 22		85:5	19 92:17, 21	9 228:21
87:1 89:8	63:4, 6		stratify	93:2, 9, 19	229:1
121:17	67:24, 25		78:11	104:21, 24	230:13, 21,
132:6	74:25		stratifying	109:4	24 231:1, 3,
137:16	75:19		77:21	117:19	4, 7 234:3, 4,
150:8	76:17		Street 2:6	118:1	10 235:11,
192:17	85:22 86:4,	3:3, 13		126:15	14, 22, 24
193:15	16, 24 87:3,	strength		129:14, 24	243:20
195:19, 20,	7 92:17, 22	63:20 65:2,		130:10	245:2

Study	5:17	19, 22 194:9, 33:11 48:10, 24 49:12, 22, 24 63:10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21 64:7, 10 65:14, 16 67:20 70:1 72:5, 7, 13, 20, 24 73:9 74:18 75:2, 4 77:8 82:13 89:24 91:4, 7 103:2 105:17 114:19 120:19 126:12 128:2 130:8 132:8, 16, 21 133:19 136:7 146:24 147:2, 5, 6, 7, 18 148:9, 12, 14, 16 151:13 152:16 155:1, 5, 20 156:3, 16, 20 157:4 158:19 159:22 165:6 167:1, 3, 6 173:17, 22 175:2 189:21 190:2, 3 192:4, 24 193:11, 18,	18 209:25 210:2 211:3, 5 222:23 223:1, 8, 15 228:22 241:14 243:12 210:22 136:8 stuff 9:13 43:20 subcategories 62:1 subgroup 78:1, 2 86:13 subgroups 77:10 78:1 85:17, 20 subject 96:22 242:11 subjective 146:10, 13, 22 subjectivity 146:20 148:21 149:10 151:8 subjects 174:13, 16 submitted 8:15, 24 9:8 10:7, 16 12:21 45:20 113:4 114:3, 4	subscriber 122:4 subscription 121:23 subset 62:18 129:19 substances 7:20 studying 99:3 study's 62:24 stuff 9:13 196:13 197:2, 10 198:4, 9, 24 subtypes 54:19, 22 55:15 57:21 62:25 196:4 197:7, 12, 16, 17 198:17, 23 199:5, 8, 16 225:20 227:4, 7 146:10, 13, 22 14:20 16 196:10, 24 149:10 151:8 32:23 97:7, 8 206:11 suggested 23:9 suggesting 88:3 209:11 suggests 225:4	3:13 sum 12:23 summary 5:20 97:17 211:11, 15 215:14, 17 summer 13:7 60:13 supplement 87:12 Supplementa 1 4:23 5:6, 17 69:7 104:11, 17, 19 127:6, 8, 13, 17 128:2, 5, 24 130:3, 15 152:14, 18, 23 104:11, 17, 19 127:6, 8, 13, 17 128:2, 15 152:14, 18, 23 153:20 180:10 181:4, 5, 8 182:24 184:13 185:7 189:7, 11 Supplementa ry 5:9 126:25 127:2, 21 128:25 153:16, 17, 20 153:16, 17, 20 44:11 90:22 195:2 200:10 231:17 52:22 supporting 201:18	supposed 42:18 180:4 sure 6:19 21:13, 17 23:15 25:20 32:20 42:20 53:4 55:18 57:15, 16 68:23 96:13 100:3 106:5 115:14 118:22 123:18 124:19 131:14 142:12 150:7 153:13 158:13 170:6 177:5 221:13 223:23 227:5, 25 229:25 230:7 surgeries 78:16 85:11, 12 176:18 surgery 78:23 surprising 166:23 swear 224:1 switched 183:14 184:4 sworn 6:4 252:7
--------------	------	---	---	---	---	--

synonymous	23 187:8	12:10 13:3,	13, 17 115:9	219:2
212:20	188:5, 13, 19	8 19:4, 8, 16,	117:17	220:23
Systematic	189:11	19 20:2, 21,	120:20	221:23
5:9 26:21	Tables	25 21:22	121:7	222:5, 9, 24
89:23	127:13, 22	22:15 23:9	128:6, 11	223:7, 12
96:11	128:2, 5	24:12	129:5	227:19, 22
134:5, 10	Taher 90:9,	25:24	131:2, 10, 18	228:3, 17, 20,
137:7, 12	20 92:16	26:14, 17	139:6	23 229:2, 12
	93:25	28:4, 11, 14	143:10	230:14, 22
< T >	96:14	32:6, 13, 14,	155:3, 7	231:3, 18, 22
Table 5:6, 9	97:10 98:1,	23 33:6, 12,	162:19	234:17, 19
59:6, 7, 14	20 99:8	15 34:1	166:8, 15	236:9, 20
61:18, 23	147:25	35:9 36:23	171:18, 23	237:25
62:15 63:6,	148:5, 19	37:12 38:3	173:1, 6, 16,	241:3, 14, 16,
8 73:16, 18	149:4	39:10	21 174:13	18 242:18
77:12 86:2	150:4, 9, 12,	40:13, 17	175:4	246:7
90:25 92:7	17, 24	41:11, 16	176:17, 25	247:22
93:25	209:21	42:9 43:2	178:23	TALCUM
96:17	211:2	49:8 50:2,	179:9, 21	1:6 5:8
116:4, 17	take 25:1	13 55:4	181:18	81:13
124:6	39:14 40:1,	56:3, 17, 20	182:4	82:10
126:24, 25	3 48:19	59:8, 23	183:21	134:4, 8
127:6, 8, 17	66:3, 11, 15	60:7 61:4,	184:5, 20, 25	136:18
128:25	116:14	25 72:11	185:22	137:3
130:15	135:17	73:2 74:17	186:2, 11	158:18
146:24	136:14	77:24	191:1, 4, 12,	159:21
151:18, 25	160:12, 17,	78:13, 23	14, 18	174:24
152:15, 18	19, 21, 22	79:1 80:19	192:21, 23	190:18
153:16, 18,	171:2	88:6 90:12,	193:1, 23	249:1
20 155:2, 6,	176:10	18 91:2, 11,	194:11	talk 28:6,
16 157:13,	177:7	20 92:8	195:9	18 29:24
23 158:17	202:14	94:1, 9, 25	196:12	55:13
162:18	212:24	95:3, 9	197:1	131:23
166:11, 12,	217:4	96:14	199:12	133:24
17 168:11	220:16	102:3, 5, 8,	201:17, 21	140:13
173:7	223:19	10, 13, 17	202:23	200:16
174:6	227:10	105:4	205:22, 23,	talked 27:6,
178:22	taken 2:3	106:13, 24	25 208:16	10 41:1
179:25	7:12 32:1	108:20, 23	209:1, 11	53:12
180:10, 22	249:8	109:1, 2, 6,	210:22	105:3
181:4, 5, 8	talc 4:21	20, 24 110:9	211:10, 14	119:11
182:24	5:12, 16, 17	111:3	216:8, 13, 19,	167:23
183:4	8:12 9:15	112:11, 19,	20, 21, 25	195:14
184:13, 18,	11:11	20 113:3, 10,	218:21	200:15

233:19	176:23	141:21	theory	126:6, 8, 9
243:6, 8	177:2	142:22	108:15	129:22, 23
246:21	191:12, 19	145:7	222:5	130:6
talking	tend 133:11	158:12	thing 6:19	137:2, 5, 15
14:18 21:6	term	169:14	32:16	138:13
22:17	100:21	170:15	68:19	139:4
25:21	106:6, 9, 12	192:1	123:20	140:1, 15
28:19	108:19, 21	205:18	125:20	141:18
72:20 79:7	110:8	223:11	160:16	142:5, 6, 15
101:3	142:19	239:8, 11	201:5	145:2
105:7	termed 41:7	252:13	219:14, 17	147:5, 6, 23
109:18	terms 13:7,	testing 7:22	things	148:13
119:11	25 86:24	101:25	47:24	150:17, 19,
122:13	122:17	217:25	150:15	20, 21 153:5
139:15	123:11	Texas 10:5	177:5, 21	158:22
150:14, 15,	133:15	text 186:16	201:1, 14	172:13
17, 19	169:19	188:4	203:3	176:12
166:14	174:23	224:10	think 13:10	177:17
177:18	192:25	textbook	15:19	179:12, 19
196:8	214:4	71:22 210:8	20:13, 18	180:11
202:2, 17, 19	223:11	Thank 8:2	24:9 28:6,	181:5
229:8, 11, 12	234:8, 9	26:12	8, 9, 11 29:9	182:23
taught	test 36:18,	36:19 43:4	32:16	183:16
18:16, 23	20 98:14, 15	61:12	33:22 44:1,	190:14
48:5	102:15	66:16	11 47:4, 11	192:3, 16
teach 48:5	tested	73:19	49:1 53:4,	193:3, 15
tell 22:20	217:20	92:15	7, 11 56:11	195:4, 8, 24
27:3 38:25	testified 6:5	130:20	64:18 67:3,	196:10, 24
48:4 55:7	22:8 90:1	137:1	12 69:1	197:15
58:1 60:14	176:9 205:4	184:15	70:23 72:8	198:3, 8
82:7 98:24	testify 81:2	199:20	74:2 76:1,	199:11
113:12	228:7 252:7	201:13	13 78:19	200:13
129:1	testifying	207:2	81:6 86:19	201:9, 14
179:18	7:17 81:4	211:22	87:5 88:19	202:23
199:17	89:4, 16	229:24	89:17 92:2	206:5, 15
221:5	170:2	244:2 245:9	97:4, 5, 18	207:3, 16
telling	228:2, 5, 8	Thanks	100:22	208:11
38:14 39:22	testimony	31:4 96:19	104:25	209:4, 20, 24
tells 67:19	11:10	theoretic	105:11	210:6
TEM	15:24, 25	178:3, 4, 5	112:7, 8	211:17
100:21	16:1 32:21	theoretical	114:17, 25	213:24
101:11	42:21	178:14	115:4	214:1
ten 24:2	88:22		116:16	216:2, 6
138:12	121:3		125:12	221:6

222:12, 13,	64:17, 22	218:3	185:24	167:17, 19
15 223:8	65:2, 16, 22	233:7	195:5	189:4
225:8	71:14 77:6	243:18	196:5, 7	215:8, 11, 15
234:5	99:19	tired 217:2	199:6, 14	245:22
235:6, 9, 16,	109:15	223:17	209:14	transcript
17 236:1, 2,	112:24	227:11, 12	213:6	249:7
23 237:10	120:1	TISI 3:8	217:17	transformati
238:25	138:11	tissue	225:3	on 206:19
243:17	160:13	225:25	topic	translates
thinking	167:10, 11	title 46:25	111:22	221:15
78:4	178:24	115:23, 25	209:17	Transmission
thinks 69:6	179:21	120:2	226:19	100:25
thorough	180:6	134:1	233:20	101:5, 7
16:21	187:24	158:16	246:7	transparent
26:20 28:8	190:25	titled 4:11	247:21	140:1
thoroughly	223:4	25:5 231:10	topics 37:23	143:23
109:14	231:25	titles 46:24	total 8:16	145:23
thought	233:21	today 11:6	9:14, 21	tremolite
11:15	235:4	26:6 35:7	12:23 59:1,	106:21
16:20	242:24	36:1 40:11	3, 5 60:16	trend 95:7
23:21 29:4	244:8	44:21	173:11	trends
92:1 149:7,	times 7:6	88:11	219:5	232:24
16 151:10	60:10, 12	139:7	totally	trial 40:23
159:4	125:13	170:2, 11	63:19	228:2, 5, 6, 7
163:16	137:19	172:24	141:5 216:3	Triangle
175:22	138:4, 10, 12,	197:7	town 67:2	17:13
189:17	18 139:19	198:14	Toxicology	tried 49:22,
190:21	141:4	228:15	4:20 90:11	23 235:19
193:14	142:16	242:14	tract 59:12	Trish 9:18
207:6	145:14, 16	246:21	78:5 86:10	true 99:2
240:10, 14,	155:1, 8, 10,	told 11:16	87:5, 8	172:19
15	15, 17, 24	32:18	205:23	tracts 77:15
three 101:6	156:6, 7, 12,	57:24	78:7, 9	192:17
142:16	18, 24, 25	84:19	train 207:6	193:16
221:8	157:8, 12, 21	95:16	TRANGLE	229:15, 21
232:6, 9, 18	158:2, 9	103:20	245:3	249:10
ties 48:25	159:11, 19	204:20	3:17 12:15	252:13
till 18:7	162:22, 23	213:3 235:7	25:10, 14, 18,	truly 52:1
30:15	163:19	top 20:7	22 26:10	71:2
time 6:20	164:1, 20, 22,	50:11	82:23	142:14
18:11, 16	23 165:2, 10,	59:13 68:8	101:1	146:11
21:8, 25	11, 12 170:5	136:16	160:15	truth 252:8
32:5, 6	201:20	158:4	161:25	
55:10	217:20, 24	183:18	163:4	

try	23:15	30:6 44:20	typographica	Unclear	unearned
55:8	229:15	45:23	1 182:10	172:10	14:15
trying	11:1, 3 14:17	86:23, 25	< U >	uncommon	UNITED
29:23	41:5	113:24	Uh-huh	210:11	1:1 101:17
70:23		114:6, 7	13:17	underestimat	241:2
137:6		150:14	15:11, 20	undergone	universe
152:5, 23		173:17, 22	30:25	210:18	universities
163:24		179:21	81:17 84:4	underlie	22:18
169:24		212:13	116:18	214:20	University
184:8		type 58:2	119:13, 16	215:19	13:7 22:19
195:4		100:23	121:20	underlying	110:17
223:25		119:25	129:3	170:3	unpublished
230:24		215:22	151:19	underrepresen	99:8, 16
tubal	78:16, 20 176:9, 15,	types 208:9	162:14	tation	unusual
18, 23		225:5, 10	173:3	105:3	240:10, 15
tubes		typewriting	174:8	understand	update
151:16		252:12	179:23	10:9 14:17	27:20
153:24		typical	180:3	16:13 30:3	updated
154:18		40:16	181:3, 12, 16,	35:12 36:8	18:8 21:19
161:12		75:15	25 183:1, 7,	63:19 76:8	27:13, 16, 17
176:19		128:1	9 184:19	120:21	44:16, 24
206:13		138:13	200:18	124:19	45:11 64:20
225:23		143:25	209:2	134:23	Use 4:13,
226:8, 14		144:21	225:17	139:4	16, 21 5:1, 8,
Tuesday		176:14	241:20	160:18	14, 16 22:15
1:15		190:25	243:13	165:24	41:7, 11
tumor	62:3	191:11	247:13	208:20	49:22 55:4
turn	83:21	typically	ultimate	214:19	56:3, 17
90:25		52:8 76:14	235:23	215:18	58:11, 15
102:3		78:19 79:2	ultimately	227:25	59:14, 23
126:24		113:1	70:11	understandin	60:8, 11, 12,
149:18		114:14	unaware	g 7:16	18 61:4, 25
211:18		139:13	103:21	73:10	62:8 72:6,
213:5		140:13	126:23	159:3	19 73:2
twice		143:3	213:3	216:4, 7	74:17 79:1,
169:15		169:23	UNC 16:23	238:22	4 81:14, 21
215:23		170:25	18:3, 7	249:13	82:15 83:3,
twice-per-		176:10	22:14, 24	Understood	9 85:22
week	169:17	206:9	23:2, 4, 9	75:12	86:16 87:7
Two	5:17	typo 183:3, 4	24:11 53:3	114:16	90:12, 18
7:6	13:13	184:2, 4	uncertainty	136:19	91:2, 11, 20
29:9, 11, 15		187:17	95:10	137:10	92:8 93:14
		188:2			94:9 95:13

96:13	182:3, 14	27:11	versus	160:12, 17
113:1	183:5, 21	valid	70:12	173:4
115:10, 18	184:5, 20, 25	value	148:4 157:3	189:2
116:1	185:16, 22	85:19 86:3,	vice	196:6
117:16	186:2, 11	25 209:21	view	201:25
120:20	187:6, 10, 11	values	148:25	202:14
128:6, 7, 11	188:8, 11, 14,	68:10, 20	226:5	217:12
131:3, 4, 18	20, 23	76:4 117:9	views	220:4, 7
134:3, 8	189:22	125:10, 17	virtually	230:6
136:18	190:2, 13, 14,	128:21	210:17	236:12
137:4, 8, 19	15, 19 191:1,	193:8	vision	98:15
138:3, 22	4, 6, 14, 17,	variation	voice	36:13 75:8
139:8, 15	18 192:6, 24	126:11	volume	85:2
140:22	193:23	191:13	129:16	101:12
141:8, 15, 18	194:11	varied	139:21	
142:2	199:12	variety	< W >	141:3, 23
144:6	213:23	60:11	wager	143:8
145:16	214:7, 21	various	202:13	159:2
146:21	215:20	48:7 49:8	wait	173:2
151:12, 13	221:23	61:25 72:3	61:13	221:13
153:11	222:9, 24	79:5 81:21	79:11 84:6	Washington
155:4, 13, 15,	236:9, 20	104:21, 24	86:5 121:2	3:4
17 156:6, 13,	241:14, 16,	118:1	158:22	way
18 157:8, 13,	18, 21	169:25	180:23	19 49:11, 15
22 158:6, 9,	242:18	233:9	185:4	53:5 82:1
18 159:6, 20,	243:24	234:10	187:18	93:15
21 162:20	useful 159:4	vary	188:6 237:2	102:12, 15
163:8, 13	users	225:14,	want	111:21
165:19, 22	140:23	15	18:13	
166:3, 8, 9,	154:21	vast	29:16	125:12
15 167:2, 8,	159:9	versa	30:11	129:17
25 168:8, 10,	191:15	version	34:21	146:13
12, 20, 25	192:21, 23	76:23	37:15	170:24
170:12, 22	uses 142:19	99:14	38:20	214:2
171:18, 23	191:12	113:25	39:14, 18	ways
173:6, 8, 12,	usually	114:2, 12, 14	42:20	222:11
16, 21 174:2,	46:20	116:10, 12	58:20 66:3,	weak
6, 13, 15	69:23 71:8	124:11	6, 10 69:6	214:20
176:17, 25	190:19	127:4	75:5 81:4,	215:19
177:23	215:6	171:25	25 82:5	weaker
178:20, 23		versions	84:11, 15	146:8
179:2, 10, 20,	< V >	113:24	116:9, 10	web
24 180:1, 15	Vaguely	114:7, 10	118:22	23:4
181:18, 20			122:3	22:6, 24
			158:13	23:5 24:14,

19, 25 25:11	16:1 18:5	well-	153:1, 15	42:13, 25
26:9 32:2	25:1, 22	designed	155:6	44:3, 9
websites	28:22 35:5	147:6	162:4	48:4 49:19
23:10	46:11, 14	well-	178:15	50:6, 17
week 99:21	47:12 55:9	established	189:9	51:21
137:20	73:13	206:3	202:2, 17, 19	52:14
138:4, 10, 18	77:23 80:5	well-	209:9	53:10, 19
139:19	84:11	regarded	West 3:18	56:19
141:4	91:12, 21	54:16	we've 13:23	57:11 60:4
145:14, 16	94:23	well-	27:6 46:2	61:6, 8
155:2, 8, 11,	105:16, 21	respected	160:9	63:16
15, 17, 24	108:19	20:13 212:2	209:4	65:15 66:8
156:6, 7, 12,	122:1	went 21:8	219:18	67:12, 16
18, 24, 25	133:19	26:20	227:9	73:17 74:1,
157:8, 12, 22	136:19	155:25	whack	5 76:1
158:2, 9	137:10	156:21	12:24	79:9 84:11
159:12	138:17	166:3	WHEREOF	88:23
164:21, 23	146:18	177:17	252:20	91:23 92:6
165:2, 12	148:15	194:17	WHI 65:19,	93:13
168:22, 23	149:14	223:7	21	94:19
169:15	166:18	Wentzensen	white	103:20
170:5, 7, 23	168:21	52:4, 12	117:12, 17	107:4, 11
242:24	172:9	53:23 54:4		108:9
243:18	177:14	172:4, 8	Whittenmore	110:5
weighed	178:8	211:8, 16	148:7, 9	111:14, 18
49:11 52:11	181:8	214:18	Whoa	118:9, 18
weighing	186:3	221:14	229:17, 18	120:22
49:12	187:15	222:17	wide 191:13	126:6
123:15	188:3	224:4	wildly 12:24	127:11
weighs 49:2	190:9	225:3	wind 146:22	128:20
weight	193:13	241:7	witness 2:2	129:9
48:23 49:6,	196:19	246:20	8:3, 22	132:5
16, 17 65:24	207:16	we're 25:21	9:20 12:20	135:6
67:9 88:8	212:19	29:14	13:15	136:1
114:19	223:4	30:20 34:6	22:17 24:6	137:2
234:9	228:4, 9	41:4 58:9,	26:13	138:6
weighted	230:10	16 59:13	27:15	139:11
234:6	238:2, 24	69:15	28:21 29:8	140:11
weighting	239:2 243:8	82:19, 21	30:21	141:22
136:8	well-	90:16	31:24 32:9	142:14
weights	conducted	115:24	34:7, 10, 20	143:2
49:10 234:3	133:6	119:9	35:4, 10	144:20
Well 8:13		127:12	36:5 37:2	149:6
10:20 13:5		139:7	40:15	150:7

151:4	227:12	125:1, 22	138:3	written
153:3, 19	230:18	126:14	148:4, 8, 17	28:4 33:20
154:13	231:21	129:19	149:1, 19	50:3, 14
155:19	232:11, 20	130:23	151:12	51:10, 17
156:15	234:22	131:5, 16	152:12	53:21
157:16, 24	236:14, 22	132:9	154:2	233:8
158:13, 24	237:15	136:17	161:9	241:6
159:1, 25	238:22	139:21	165:19, 21	244:17
160:7, 18, 23	239:12	141:3	168:1	wrong
162:1	240:7	143:9	169:1	70:24
163:3, 12	247:6	151:13, 16	170:13	88:15
164:5	252:10, 14,	152:1, 9, 16	243:1, 2, 5,	163:17
165:5	20	153:22, 23	10	wrote 33:18
166:2	woman	154:3, 14, 17,	word 16:18	113:22
170:16	176:19	18 155:13	40:20, 21	114:1
175:14, 21	191:11	159:6	83:24, 25	238:6, 9
176:22	201:25	161:12	84:8 141:19	244:9
178:13	Women 5:2,	173:1, 11	work 8:14	245:24
180:17, 25	4 19:13	174:9, 23	15:21	Wu 161:15,
181:10	22:14 58:2	175:4	18:12	23, 24, 25
182:23	59:1, 6, 10,	176:10	32:25 33:2	162:1, 9
184:14	11, 24 60:8	179:7, 8	52:22 53:3,	223:15, 24
185:14	61:5 64:8	180:14	13 54:1, 6	W-U 162:2
186:7, 10	70:1 72:8	190:17	96:9	
187:20, 25	77:13, 14, 18,	191:1, 18	113:16	< X >
191:3	19, 21 78:7,	193:1	122:7	X-ray 100:4,
192:2	11, 12, 17, 19	201:23	134:23	6
194:3, 14	79:1 80:18	202:13	171:1	XRD 100:1
196:17	81:13, 21	224:23	172:8	
197:6, 24	82:4, 10	241:14, 15,	218:9, 17	< Y >
198:13	85:7, 10	16	worked	Y'all 101:5
199:3, 23	86:9, 13	Women's	43:6 96:11	Yeah 10:13
200:18, 25	87:4 89:13	65:19, 21	170:25	13:15
202:6	91:8 94:9,	132:8, 22	working	16:10, 14, 17,
204:12, 14,	11, 15, 25	wondering	48:11	25 17:15
20 205:20	95:2	28:2	works 17:18	25:18
207:4, 14	102:13	wonky	worried	27:25 30:8,
208:7	115:10, 19	124:11	23:20	14 47:7
209:14	116:2, 22	Woolen	worse	51:1 66:8
214:12	117:8, 11, 12,	104:5	192:25	83:12
217:3, 14	16, 17	133:25	write 40:17	102:24
218:11	119:23	134:2, 14	83:1 233:12	111:8, 10, 14,
221:6	120:4	135:18, 22	writing	18 114:9
226:10, 22	124:13, 23	136:5	16:7 42:25	119:21

122:21	102:16			
153:11, 21	120:14			
160:21	122:22			
162:12	132:10			
163:5	163:2, 4, 8,			
164:25	12, 16, 17, 19,			
167:10	25 165:9			
168:5, 14	173:12			
169:18	176:24			
174:16, 25	177:2			
180:25	190:19			
183:19	191:12, 19			
184:21, 24	201:24			
185:14	yep 152:25			
186:7	yesterday			
187:20, 25	7:4			
189:4, 5	York 3:18			
200:25	Yorker 24:4			
201:12	you-all			
207:7	47:12			
215:12	young 72:8			
217:3, 8	younger			
237:15	131:4, 11, 20			
242:13	174:14			
243:3 247:3				
year 18:19	< Z >			
60:13	Zantac 15:3,			
190:14	6, 14 20:4			
192:7 222:8	233:15			
years 13:3	234:2, 19			
15:3 16:10,	235:1, 12, 21			
17 17:2	236:4			
20:6 37:8	240:19			
53:25 54:2	Zoom			
55:17, 21	177:14			
60:13, 18				
64:21				
65:11, 17, 23				
66:25 70:7				
94:1, 10, 12,				
15, 25 95:3,				
12, 15, 22, 23				
96:12				
99:11				